

Walter M. Horton, Robertson, Mo., in place of F. J. Albers, removed.
 Raiman L. Coates, Sarcosie, Mo., in place of V. F. Whisner, transferred.

NEBRASKA

William Stuart Campbell, Waterloo, Nebr., in place of W. S. Campbell. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Carroll H. Metcalf, Alstead, N. H., in place of S. J. Moore, retired.

NEW JERSEY

Myra Pulis, Campgaw, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1940.

Harry F. Sawyer, Far Hills, N. J., in place of H. E. Poulson, retired.

Merritt J. McAlinden, Hopewell, N. J., in place of E. P. Stout. Incumbent's commission expired March 10, 1941.

George M. Gibson, Moorestown, N. J., in place of G. M. Gibson. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

NEW MEXICO

Selah C. Hoy, East Vaughn, N. Mex., in place of S. C. Hoy. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

NORTH CAROLINA

Annie E. Black, Rocky Point, N. C., in place of J. B. Hayes, transferred.

NORTH DAKOTA

Wesley P. Josewski, Maxbass, N. Dak., in place of W. P. Josewski. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Frank S. Kenny, New England, N. Dak., in place of H. A. Borcharding, deceased.

OKLAHOMA

Lee Kennedy, Broken Bow, Okla., in place of Lee Kennedy. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Jesse W. Keith, Halleyville, Okla., in place of J. W. Keith. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Hugh Johnson, Hugo, Okla., in place of Hugh Johnson. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Rex T. Strickland, Madill, Okla., in place of R. T. Strickland. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Tom L. Pike, Weleetka, Okla., in place of T. L. Pike. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

OREGON

Ermel H. Hosley, Chiloquin, Oreg., in place of E. H. Hosley. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

John S. Spike, Echo, Oreg., in place of J. S. Spike. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Ruby I. Loundree, Sandy, Oreg., in place of R. I. Loundree. Incumbent's commission expired June 18, 1942.

Oscar Edwin Marvin, Wallowa, Oreg., in place of O. E. Marvin. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

PENNSYLVANIA

Dorothy M. Nice, Esterly, Pa., in place of C. H. Adams, deceased.

Raymond R. Kinsinger, Halifax, Pa., in place of R. R. Kinsinger. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Helen G. Mack, Lafayette Hill, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Rebecca Campbell, Midway, Pa., in place of Rebecca Campbell. Incumbent's commission expired April 29, 1942.

Elmer G. Corter, Mill Hall, Pa., in place of E. G. Corter. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

John M. Langan, Moscow, Pa., in place of J. M. Langan. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

William G. Loy, Newport, Pa., in place of W. G. Loy. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Gerald H. Rickerson, North Warren, Pa., in place of G. H. Rickerson. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Emma R. Dexter, Roulette, Pa., in place of E. R. Dexter. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Charles J. Trexler, Windgap, Pa., in place of C. J. Trexler. Incumbent's commission expired June 9, 1942.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Frank S. Ryan, Kimball, S. Dak., in place of C. W. Richards, deceased.

TENNESSEE

Amos F. Hassell, Collinwood, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

James F. Bryan, Munford, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

J. Green Hawks, Ralston Station, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

TEXAS

Edgar L. Watson, Athens, Tex., in place of E. L. Watson. Incumbent's commission expired March 28, 1942.

Louis C. Nordt, Damon, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Perry H. Sparks, Hamlin, Tex., in place of Z. H. Bonner, transferred.

William E. Votaw, Jarrell, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Annie M. Martin, Kemah, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Allen L. Burditt, La Ward, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Georgie F. Morgan, Leary, Tex. Office became Presidential April 1, 1942.

Ellis M. Bush, Lytle, Tex., in place of J. L. Kay, retired.

Harriet M. Rust, Vanderbilt, Tex., in place of J. J. Dutton, removed.

VIRGINIA

John H. Bowdoin, Bloxom, Va., in place of J. H. Bowdoin. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Norma H. Fulton, Drakes Branch, Va., in place of N. H. Fulton. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

C. Coleman Curtis, Lee Hall, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Roy Hockman, Maurertown, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Lloyd Sullenberger, Monterey, Va., in place of Lloyd Sullenberger. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Annie G. Whitten, Montvale, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

William C. Nelson, New Church, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Samuel F. Atwill, Sr., Reedville, Va., in place of S. F. Atwill. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Elijah S. Slate, South Boston, Va., in place of E. S. Slate. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Janet L. Freeman, Stony Creek, Va., in place of W. B. Cocke, Jr., resigned.

Fannie B. B. Sale, Tappahannock, Va., in place of F. B. B. Sale. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

WASHINGTON

Archie Constable, Seaview, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Joseph Horrigan, Kenmore, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

I. Wells Littlejohn, Pateros, Wash., in place of I. W. Littlejohn. Incumbent's commission expired April 1, 1942.

Jessie M. Severyns, Sunnyside, Wash., in place of J. M. Severyns. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

William W. Moffitt, Naselle, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

WEST VIRGINIA

Jessie M. Shields, Barrackville, W. Va., in place of O. R. Conaway, resigned.

Mabel H. Campbell, Newburg, W. Va., in place of F. W. Horchler, retired.

Martha L. Britton, Poca, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Elijah F. Midkiff, West Hamlin, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

WISCONSIN

Vernon A. Martin, Amherst, Wis., in place of V. A. Martin. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Alex G. Mohr, Cambria, Wis., in place of A. G. Mohr. Incumbent's commission expired May 31, 1942.

Velma C. Grossman, Dale, Wis., in place of V. C. Grossman. Incumbent's commission expired April 21, 1941.

Melvin I. Dunn, Fall River, Wis., in place of M. I. Dunn. Incumbent's commission expired June 8, 1942.

Albert E. Hansen, Mendota, Wis., in place of A. E. Hansen. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Oscar M. Rickard, Merrillan, Wis., in place of O. M. Rickard. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Frances M. Kirby, Montreal, Wis., in place of M. E. Meade, retired.

Maurice A. Reeves, Fewaukee, Wis., in place of M. A. Reeves. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

John V. Nickodem, Princeton, Wis., in place of J. V. Nickodem. Incumbent's commission expired May 25, 1942.

Edward A. Peters, Waterloo, Wis., in place of E. A. Peters. Incumbent's commission expired May 31, 1942.

WYOMING

Jack R. Gage, Sheridan, Wyo., in place of J. C. Jackson, removed.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate December 15 (legislative day of November 30), 1942:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Louis E. Goodman to be United States district judge for the northern district of California.

REJECTION

Executive nomination rejected by the Senate December 15 (legislative day of November 30), 1942:

POSTMASTER

Robert Leo Quirk to be postmaster at Washington in the State of Louisiana.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 15, 1942

The House was called to order at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Blessed be the holy name of the Lord, our God, in whom are centered our hopes, our longings, and our aspirations. We pray Thee to fill our minds with wisdom and our hearts with grace that our faith may spring like the eagle that soars to meet the sun. Breasting these heavy days, do Thou inspire us to seek the floors of spiritual depths, ceasing to be satisfied with the things visible because we have seen the glory of God, the source of the lustrous pearls of eternal truth.

Thou who art the good Shepherd, who leads into pastures of love and by the still waters of peace and restful quietness, waken in our waiting souls an unutterable quietness which is the living bread of the universe. We ask Thee to impart to all blind mortal eyes the loveliness

and the beauty which make them immortal, inspiring them with an awareness that however forbidding the day and dark the night, these only preclude the brightness of a dawn which is to be. Blessed Lord, we pray for those who are about through the thunder of life's battle, waiting for the sun to set as they sit on the western piazza; we clasp hands with them as they face the temple of silence and reconciliation where the burdens and the enmities of life are forgotten and buried. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by inserting a speech delivered by the Honorable Henry Morgenthau, Jr., Secretary of the Treasury, at Winston-Salem, N. C., on Saturday evening, December 12, 1942, on the occasion of the awarding of flags to firms that had gone over the top in the bond sale program and 90 percent of whose employees had cooperated in the purchase of savings bonds.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in four instances.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include a speech delivered by Hon. Sergio Osmentia, Vice President of the Philippine Commonwealth, delivered at Los Angeles, Calif.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include a letter from former Senator Robert L. Owen.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

THE RATIONING OF GASOLINE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the one element most necessary in connection with the rationing of gasoline is to simplify the whole procedure and to decentralize authority into the hands of local boards. At present great numbers of appeals are necessary because regulations do not give local boards authority or discretion to use their own judgment. In the case of farm transportation local county war boards should be able to decide how much gasoline is needed by various farmers. In the case of other transportation local ration boards should at once be given increased authority and discretion. They should be urged to use this authority and discretion in a constructive way—not warned that they will get into trouble if they make possible errors of judgment.

Such programs as this ration program are brand new, especially to the American people. They are believed necessary if we are to make sure of our supplies of rubber for the winning of this total war. There is no use shutting our eyes to the fact that they are foreign to the traditional American way of doing things, and the only salvation of the situation is to get their administration down into the local communities as much as can possibly be done. In this connection Congress should be careful to allow sufficient funds to at least give the local boards enough money to operate efficiently and to make it possible to have local boards in just as many communities as is reasonable.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON THE TAX BILL OF 1942

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing I report back (Rept. No. 2739) favorably, without amendment, a privileged resolution (H. Res. 576) authorizing the printing of the manuscript entitled "Questions and Answers on the Tax Bill of 1942" as a public document, and ask its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the manuscript prepared by Representative DANIEL A. REED containing an analysis of the Revenue Act of 1942 entitled "Questions and Answers on the Tax Bill" be printed as a House document.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record and to include an article published in the National Republic.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the legislative program today, and any other special orders, I be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I asked unanimous consent to have inserted in the Record an economic analysis prepared by the Raw Materials National Council. The Public Printer has notified me that this will cost \$112.50. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed nevertheless.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative business and other special orders, I be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

IRRATIONAL RATIONING

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

[Mr. PLUMLEY addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Record on the subject of maldistribution of meat and the shortage of meat in Massachusetts, and to include a telegram and a letter from Widetzky & Kruger, counsel for the New England Wholesale Meat Dealers Association at Boston.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

NATIONAL CONDITIONS

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute to read a paragraph which I wrote in 1901, illustrating my position now on international relations as ranking minority member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and to extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

[Mr. EATON addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

FOREIGN POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. RICH addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

OIL RATIONING

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

[Mr. DEWEY addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and to include therein an address I made on the one hundred and fifty-first anniversary of the ratification of the Bill of Rights, which we celebrate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and to include therein an editorial on the late Louis E. Kirstein, which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor of Friday, December 11, 1942.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting a radio speech I made on station WEBD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including a radio address I delivered.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on a general topic.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CIRCUIT COURT JUDGES

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 2655) to amend the Judicial Code to authorize the Chief Justice of the United States to assign circuit judges to temporary duty in circuits other than their own, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2655) entitled "An act to amend the Judicial Code to authorize the Chief Justice of the United States to assign circuit judges to temporary duty in circuits other than their own," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendment.

HATTON W. SUMNERS,
FRANCIS E. WALTER,
U. S. GUYER,

Managers on the part of the House.

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
JOHN A. DANAHER,
TOM CONNALLY,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2655) entitled "An act to amend the Judicial Code to authorize the Chief Justice of the United States to assign circuit judges to temporary duty in circuits other than their own," submit the following explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon in conference and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The purpose of the bill is to permit judges of the circuit courts of appeals to serve in circuits other than their own when designated for that purpose. The effect of the House amendment was to make necessary a request by the senior district judge before a district judge could be designated and assigned by the senior circuit judge or circuit justice to sit in another district where assistance may be needed.

The conferees were of opinion that since the House amendment concerned itself with assignment of district judges, and not circuit judges as is the purpose of the bill, the amendment should be withdrawn from consideration in connection with the present bill. The House recedes from its amendment.

HATTON W. SUMNERS,
FRANCIS E. WALTER,
U. S. GUYER,

Managers on the part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting in the RECORD a short article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

OVERTIME PAY FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, we are about to consider a resolution to provide for overtime compensation of a certain group of Federal employees. If we fail to provide for this group of people during the sunset hours of the life of the Seventy-seventh Congress, it will be a sad commentary.

I have just returned from a recent trip to South Carolina where I visited my own navy yard. I talked with numbers of the civilian guards at the gates of this tremendously expanded institution. I talked to the marine colonel in charge of these men. I learned that these guards had to work without relief or rest at a ridiculously low base pay of \$125 a month.

I also talked with numerous classes of 4-B employees in all branches of the Federal service in Charleston, a great many of whom receive only \$105 a month salary, and many of these told me of the long hours they were being compelled to work without additional remuneration when the lowest class of laborers receive in excess of \$200 a month including their overtime.

I happen to be a member of the Naval Affairs Committee of this great body. I am thoroughly familiar with the attitude of the Navy Department in this regard. This morning I talked with Mr. Piczet, civilian personnel director of the Navy Department, and he told me that failure to provide for these employees would be a serious blow to the war effort.

Remember, and this is to their eternal glory, no strikes have ever marred their illustrious record. No slow-downs have ever been charged to their hands. It should therefore be the happy privilege of every Member of Congress to take up the battle for these people and do justice where justice is due, and say to them, "well done," your Congress with grateful hearts will keep faith with you.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article by Walter Meachim on the centennial of the Oregon Trail, Opportunity To Revitalize Ideals.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a brief letter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

OVERTIME PAY FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, our fellow Member, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], has brought up a subject which truly is worthy of the closest attention on the part of the membership of this House—overtime and increased pay for Government employees. It seems to me most unfortunate that the Government of the United States should be requiring thousands of its citizens whom it employs to work 68 hours in some instances on 44 hours' pay at wages established 15 years ago, whereas in the same communities private industrial employees have been receiving both overtime pay and a 15-percent increase in wages under decisions of the National War Labor Board.

They are performing exactly the same type of labor. It seems only fair that Government officials should look out for those who are working for the Government just as much as they look out for those working for private employers who are paid the entire amount of their salaries or wages indirectly by the Federal Government. In some cases we find that persons who have been enjoying overtime pay up until November 30 have now had it taken away from them. They could have been working elsewhere at higher wages than they got from the Government, but they stayed with the Government because of the hope held out to them that they would receive overtime pay and increases in pay. This Congress should pass such legislation as is necessary to accomplish these purposes on a fair basis.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a short item.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. PIERCE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

ISSUANCE OF PATENTS FOR CERTAIN LANDS TO THE TOWN OF FLETCHER, OKLA.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2393) amending the provisions governing the issuance of patents for certain lands to the town of Fletcher, Okla.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I am not going to object, because I understand this land comprises just a few lots far removed from any oil fields.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. That is correct.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this the bill that was brought up yesterday?

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes.

Mr. RICH. Was the gentleman who objected yesterday notified that the bill would be brought up this morning?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. He was notified.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior may issue a patent in fee simple to the town of Fletcher, Okla., under section 22 of the act of May 2, 1890 (26 Stat. 91; 43 U. S. C. 1094), for the tracts in that town reserved for parks, schools, and other public purposes, without inserting in the patent the condition required by such section that the lands shall be maintained for the purposes mentioned.

Sec. 2. The proceeds derived from the sale of such parcels of land shall be used by the Town Board of Fletcher, Okla., first, to repair and improve the water system in such town; and, second, to construct a town building containing, among other things, a fire station, jail, and town hall.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therewith certain quoted material.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter addressed to the Transportation and Investigating Board.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address by Raymond Moley.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

MRS. J. C. TOMMEY

Mr. MEYER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 7171) for the relief of Mrs. J. C. Tommey, with a Senate amendment, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$3,500."

The Senate amendment was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE SECOND WAR POWERS BILL

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the Ways and Means Committee considered the bill H. R. 7762, the first version of the Doughton bill, which, after consideration, was apparently tabled on the theory that the President would have too much power in the suspension of laws dealing with tariffs and immigration. Why the proviso dealing with aliens was inserted in that bill referred to the Ways and Means Committee, I do not understand, except that it has been the practice in the last few years to refer bills to committees that ordinarily would not handle some of the subjects in the bill. We have seen the practice grow up, and bills sent to the Judiciary Committee that rightfully belonged to the Committee on Immigration, and vice versa. Other committees besides mine are complaining, and I hope and trust the leadership of the House will stop this practice. If it is to be continued, they might as well abolish some of the committees and refer all the bills to one committee, and let it pass upon all legislation.

True, I did not show too much interest in the first draft of this bill (H. R. 7762), but when it was superseded by H. R. 7832 and then tabled I was so amazed that I decided to look into the matter. I have examined the testimony before the committee carefully. Why the Ways and Means Committee refused to give the President these powers in time of war has not been explained by anyone. It has not been explained by any member of the committee. I cannot see why the President as Commander in Chief should not have the power, as requested, to move certain material and certain people and do other things for war purposes. The President cannot come to the Congress every time occasion and need for such powers arise and ask for these powers. There has to be someone responsible at the head to carry on.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. For a brief question.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that the Ways and Means Committee, when it held its hearings, learned that everything proposed in the bill was already being done under the general law?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Well, that may be so, I will not split hairs with you on that, but at the same time your Chief Executive asked for that power to be given to him by law.

Mr. KNUSTON. Is that all the reason the gentleman needs, that the Chief Executive asked for it?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I will follow through.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. For a brief question.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. The gentleman must believe, and I ask him if he does believe, that the Congress should surrender all of its powers to the Chief Executive? If it does, should the Congress not go home and let the President run the whole show?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The answer is no. I feel very strongly on this subject and would be the last person to advocate that Congress surrender any of its powers.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. That is what the gentleman proposes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I am arguing that an emergency exists, we are at war, and the President cannot come here every day asking the Congress for something in order to be able to carry out his duties as the Commander in Chief of our armed forces.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. May I say to the gentleman that the thing he calls an emergency simply does not exist, because the things that were proposed under this bill H. R. 7762, as I have told the gentleman already, are now being done and have been done right along under the laws, regulations, and general practice.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That may be so. Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Well, it is so.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Whether it is being done in accordance with law or not, I do not know. It may be done in accordance with some Executive order. But that is not the point I am calling your attention to.

Mr. Speaker, as the newspapers pointed out, one of the important factors in having H. R. 7832 tabled was—and I want my colleague to listen to this—was the testimony of one Marvin K. Hart, who appeared before the Ways and Means Committee in opposition to this bill. He calls himself president of the New York State Economic Council, and his testimony was based upon the plea not to give any more power to "that man." He is one of the professional Roosevelt haters who—as his record bears out—will oppose anything that he thinks the President may want. That was one of the experts who testified before the Ways and Means Committee.

Who is this Marvin K. Hart? He has been publicly accused of being a Fascist and of associating with Fascist sympathizers. Some of the people he has been friendly with have been indicted by the grand jury investigating Nazi sympathizers. The American lady—I cannot think of her name at the moment—who broadcast Nazi propaganda from Berlin, went to Spain with a letter of introduction from this great American, Mr. Hart. It is easy to understand that a person with such associations and such friends is opposed to anything the President may do to defeat our enemies.

What is this economic council? It is nothing but a private organization which claims to be conducting investigations of Federal and State Governments as their acts affect private enterprises. Why did not the committee find out more about this gentleman, who appointed him and

who made him the police guard of the Nation and the States? What is he investigating, what does he know, and who is financing his outfit?

Mr. Hart expressed his great satisfaction with that part of the war-power bill which prevents the President from suspending any immigration restrictions, but he states that this bill will give the President too much authority. We know this to be a misinterpretation of the provisions of H. R. 7762 as the President could not have possibly suspended the immigration laws under that bill. Mr. Hart's further contention was that the bill would permit the President to send out American citizens against their will to some foreign country on any pretext whatsoever, and the Committee on Ways and Means fell hook, line, and sinker for that. Can you picture that the President would send out any citizen that he wanted to send out just to get rid of him? This interpretation clearly shows the personal antagonism Hart has against the President. Where does Mr. Hart get his ideas? There is no such thing in contemplation, nor has there been any discussion on any such proposition. But Mr. Hart goes on further and claims that a large number of refugees have come here and he infers that they had entered illegally, not in conformity with our immigration laws and in excess of our quotas, and he continues to state that if the Congress will investigate it will find that some of them hold Federal positions in New York City and elsewhere in preference to American citizens.

Mr. Speaker, as a Member of this House and the chairman of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, I declare this statement to be a brazen and premeditated lie made for the purpose of creating distrust and disunity among our people. In the first place, as any Member of this House can easily find out by checking with the State Department, the established quotas under our immigration laws have not been filled for years. As far as his second point is concerned, you can also ascertain that there are a number of boards at the Visa Division—boards composed of people from the State Department, the War and Navy Departments, Justice Department, and F. B. I.—who have to pass upon each individual case before any person is granted a visa. Now, as far as his accusation is concerned, that refugees take away Federal positions from American citizens, every one of you here knows that under the laws we passed, no Federal agency is permitted to employ an alien. You know that under the law no Federal money can be used as salary for an alien. Yet no Member challenged Mr. Hart when he made such a ridiculous statement.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Probably some refugees would not have come into this country in the past 2 years if it were not for the individuals who have been instrumental in having them come over to this country. Certain employers of labor have simply discharged American citizens

and they have put on these new people in order that they might have work so that they could maintain themselves and the fellow who brought them over would not be responsible. That is causing more trouble in the gentleman's own city than anything else that I know of. So it is a difficult situation in which you find yourself because of what has happened in the last 2 or 3 years.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I do not think my friend got my point in the first place, and, in the second place, I do not think the question propounded has any material bearing. I have stated that Mr. Hart told the Committee on Ways and Means that so-called refugees are holding Federal positions. I challenge Mr. Hart or any other Member of this House or anyone in the country to point out to me any aliens holding Federal positions. I would be in favor of removing them very quickly, and of penalizing those responsible for putting them there.

Mr. RICH. These refugees would hardly be placed in Federal jobs unless they were able to speak English.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I am talking about what Mr. Hart said before the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. RICH. I am not talking about Mr. Hart.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Well, I am.

Mr. RICH. I was just trying to show the gentleman the difficulties and the troubles we are having.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. If the gentleman will permit me to proceed, I will try to cover that if I have time.

So far as aliens holding positions in the War Production Board or other Federal bureaus is concerned, I say it was an unfair and completely false statement that Mr. Hart made before the Committee on Ways and Means, but his statement had great influence in persuading that committee to table the bill.

In the first instance, most refugees who came to the United States in recent years had money. I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, if he wants to have the story. No alien came to this country in the last few years who did not prove to the satisfaction of the interdepartmental committee of the State Department that he would not become a public charge if admitted. Hart must know that our immigration laws are very clear on this point, and they have been enforced very strictly, that no persons can come into this country looking for jobs.

Mr. RICH. Let me say this to the gentleman.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Do not interrupt me. Let me finish my thought. I will give the gentleman a chance later.

Mr. RICH. I do not want to interrupt the gentleman.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I do not want to be discourteous, but if it is the gentleman's purpose to clear up this question, that is what I am trying to do.

As a result, only certain people with certain qualifications and under certain restrictions provided for not only by the consul in the city where the alien came from, but by the State Department, which sits in judgment and passes upon these applications, could enter this coun-

try. The moment a man claimed he was going to get a job in this country he could not enter the United States. Hart knew it, but he did not tell that to the Committee on Ways and Means, and the Committee on Ways and Means did not take the trouble to find out.

In other words, Hart tried to point out to the Committee on Ways and Means that, if you passed this war powers bill, the President would flood the country with aliens. He is too clever a man not to have known that this was not true, but he was playing up the present antialien feeling and got away with it.

The aliens who did come into this country—and I say this honestly and fairly and understand the question fully—have brought wealth into this country and have created industries to employ American citizens. A lot of them have created new employment possibilities for American citizens instead of taking jobs away from them. The statistics will prove that. Just communicate with the Department of Commerce, and they will give you all of that information, that these aliens coming from the Lowlands come in here with wealth and have created industries and are employing American citizens. I do not say that all of them are doing it, and I am not a bit concerned, but why not have the truth?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I did not say that we should put up bars and prohibit anyone from coming into our country. I think that would be wrong. However, I do think our first consideration should be to take care of all our people in America.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. RICH. Then, if we can open our doors to good, reputable citizens who want to come here, that is one thing. Certainly, however, after this war is over, if we have anything that would leave the bars down, we shall have all the riffraff of all the countries of the world coming here. That would not do, and I would oppose that to the limit.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. RICH. I believe the gentleman would oppose it, too.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Certainly I would. The laws today are so strict that it is difficult to bring anybody in. I am just trying to correct the erroneous impression created by the testimony of Mr. Hart, this great economist, who represents nobody but himself and a group of other gentlemen in New York, a self-sustaining corporation that could investigate your business and any business without having been asked to do it, if they decided that you were in conflict with their interests.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. RICH. I think they were afraid of giving that power to the President, because they did not know what he would do, and they were afraid to grant the power to him.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Oh, the gentleman and I know very well that the President

would not do anything of that kind. He knows that in his heart just as well as I do. If it is going to help the war situation, no man is going to deny the President any right that he asks in that respect. We are here all the time, and if something is wrong, we can take care of the situation.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. For just one observation. No matter what misunderstanding followed the original letter which came up, where the word "person" was included, there never was any intention to suspend the immigration laws, and we all know that. It was intended to meet peculiar situations, that in turn could have an effect on the conduct of the war. There were many individual situations that arose, and the power to meet such peculiar situations might be beneficial to our country. There was never any intention to suspend the immigration laws. The President himself said so, and despite the general impression that has been created, the record should show that there was never any intention to suspend the immigration laws. I would oppose that myself. There was only the intention to give power to meet peculiar situations that might arise from time to time, where certain things might be done that would be helpful to our country in connection with the conduct of the war.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. RICH. How about the tariff?

Mr. McCORMACK. It was not intended to suspend the tariff laws, but it was to meet individual situations, individual cases, the import of matters of material interest to the United States, where he would have to use lend-lease money to pay the tariff to bring the goods in.

Mr. RICH. And we have to pay the tariff with lend-lease money.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman think that should be necessary?

Mr. RICH. No, I think that is wrong.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes, and that was the situation it was aimed to meet.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

AUTHORITY TO RECESS THE HOUSE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order for the Speaker today to declare the House in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I suppose that is with the usual 15 minutes' notice of reconvening?

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, yes; with the usual notice of 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including a very complimentary editorial that appeared in the Bos-

ton Post, entitled "The Seventy-seventh Congress."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including an address delivered some years ago by Mr. J. D. Ross.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and to include a newspaper clipping.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and to include a resolution passed by the C. I. O.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the Delegate from Hawaii [Mr. KING] for 15 minutes.

HAWAII—FAREWELL TO CONGRESS

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, the Hawaiian language has enriched our American idiom with the word "aloha," which means affectionately both "hello" and "farewell." Today, I say to all of my friends and colleagues of the House a final aloha. As some of you know, I have reentered the service of the United States Navy, from which I resigned some years ago, and I will shortly be called to active duty. I withdrew from the congressional election upon my return home to Hawaii some weeks ago, which it happened was just after the primary election that renominated me.

I am somewhat embarrassed to be saying my farewells to my colleagues at this time, because I understand it had been assumed that I had already reported for active naval service. I believe the news accounts of my withdrawal from the campaign for reelection gave that impression, and several of my colleagues have already expressed their regrets at my departure and paid me many kind compliments.

I am now turning up after the eulogies, in defiance of Emily Post's dictum that when good-byes have been said, one should keep on going, and not linger for a too prolonged parting. But I had to come back to complete my term as Delegate; finish up my present job before taking on the new assignment; turn over as clean a slate as possible to my successor; and last but not least, extend my aloha and thanks to you all in person.

After 8 years in this House, I would not want to leave without at least a word of appreciation for the many kindnesses shown me during my four terms. I have therefore asked for these few minutes before the Seventy-seventh Congress passes into history to express my sincere thanks to the Members of this House for their uniform courtesy to me, and for the sympathetic manner in which they have received my representations on behalf of my constituency.

I am leaving Congress to reenter the naval service the day after my term expires, and hope and expect to be ordered to duty in the Pacific area. I decided

upon this course in the conviction that as a former Navy man my contribution to the winning of the war would best be made in the naval service.

I was nominated for appointment to the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis in 1905, by Hawaii's then Delegate, Prince Jonah Kuhio Kalaniana'ole, and served in the United States Navy nearly 20 years. I resigned my commission as a lieutenant commander in 1924, when peace reigned, and when I felt free to return to my native Hawaii, to live and raise a family, in the belief that no major war would occur in the remainder of my active lifetime.

You can imagine my feelings on December 7 last year. The greatest war of our history had been thrust upon us. My own Hawaii was attacked and my people found themselves in a combat zone living under drastic martial law. The Navy became engaged in an all-out struggle against the forces of ruthless and treacherous foes on all the seas of the world. Two of my Annapolis classmates were killed at Pearl Harbor, and among the men who died at their posts in that holocaust were undoubtedly many old shipmates of former years.

If there had been some way for me to return to active service sooner, I would have done so. I could not in justice to Hawaii leave my post during the first months of the war with so much to be done to help my community prepare itself for further attack. But Uncle Sam had invested a substantial sum in my training years ago, and as the civilian situation in Hawaii became better clarified I felt free to seek active naval duty, if my services could be utilized.

To succeed me Hawaii has elected Mr. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON, son of a distinguished former Governor of Hawaii, a graduate of the University of Wisconsin, and for several years the Washington correspondent of a Philadelphia newspaper. Since his return to Hawaii after this mainland experience, JOE FARRINGTON has taken an active part in our community life, has succeeded his father as the publisher of one of our leading newspapers, and has served 8 years in the Senate of Hawaii. He comes well qualified for the position of Delegate, and will make his own place in the Congress. I only ask in his behalf that my friends in this House give him a cordial welcome, as my personal friend as well as successor.

Mr. Speaker, as I look back over the 8 years of my service I can truly say that Hawaii has received fair and considerate treatment from the Congress. There have been one or two disappointments, but I am sure future Congresses will correct these exceptions. I have fought consistently for the principle of complete equality of treatment for the Territory of Hawaii with the several States in all legislation of national application, whether such legislation imposed a burden or granted a benefit. It is a source of gratification to me that in nearly every case that has come up during my service here Congress has accepted that principle as its guide.

In regard to legislation of specific application to Hawaii, I am happy to say that the Congress has in practically no

instance refused to approve measures desired by my community. As a Territory much legislation local in character must be approved by Congress. I have found the Committee on the Territories, through which most of this legislation passes, invariably sympathetic and helpful and wish to extend to its chairman and members my sincere thanks for their cooperation.

With the help of this committee, several measures have been enacted into law which strengthened the program for the rehabilitation of the native Hawaiian people that Congress initiated over 20 years ago at the request of Delegate Kalanianaʻole.

As a part Hawaiian myself, I have been deeply interested in the success of this project. It is one of my regrets upon leaving that a bill authorizing the construction of an irrigation system for the benefit of the Hawaiian homesteaders under this program is likely to die in the other body after having been approved by the House. Apparently the war precludes action at this time, and I can only hope that this legislation will be revived at some more auspicious time.

Mr. Speaker, it has been an honor to represent the Territory of Hawaii in this great legislative body. It is an experience which I shall treasure for the remaining years of my life, an experience which has confirmed my belief in and devotion to our democratic way of life.

I have had the high privilege of being the sole Representative in Congress of my community for 8 years. I am proud to have earned that distinction as a result of four elections in which I have stood for office.

A Delegate representing a Territory and without a vote in the House or in committee needs the help of his colleagues to an even greater extent than a Representative. This help I have received in full measure.

As a Republican, I have somewhat taken for granted that the Republican membership of the House would help me when I needed help. In this expectation I have never been disappointed.

But it is to me a fine commentary on the spirit of fairness with which this body functions that the majority membership of the House, especially the chairmen and majority members of the various committees on which I have served, have granted me equally friendly consideration. For this I wish to express my heartfelt thanks to the Democratic Members of the House.

I value very highly the personal friends I have made here on both sides of the aisle. If I am unable to see each of you before we scatter, may I ask that you accept this message of farewell, of aloha, as meant for every one of you.

I want, however, to say a word of special tribute to the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. DIMOND]. Because our respective Territories often have a community of interest, the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. DIMOND] and I have cooperated closely together through my four terms. He works one side of the aisle while I work the other, and thus we cover both sides. I know I but express the sentiments of this entire body when I pay my

respects to him as one of the ablest and finest men in this House and one for whom I have a warm affection and a high regard.

To you all, ladies and gentlemen, aloha a nui loa me ke malu no ke Akua, a hui hou kakou. In other words, my affectionate regards and very best wishes for your continued success and happiness in life. I hope we meet again in happier days when peace and decency again reign throughout the world. Until then, God bless you all, and aloha.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING. Yes.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman leaves, I wish to say to him that, as one member of the committee on which he has served, the Committee on Territories, I have found it to be one of the finest experiences of my life to have had the pleasure of meeting and working with the Delegate from Hawaii. He has not only been a faithful Member, and he has represented his district with faithfulness and ability, but he has won the respect, admiration, and love of every single one of us, I am sure, who have served with him on that committee. We will carry with us to the end of our lives that very happy experience.

Mr. KING. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I cannot refrain from paying tribute to my good friend from Hawaii, SAM KING. We have all great admiration and affection for him. He has been very diligent in his service to his country, and he has accomplished many things for the good of the people who have elected him to this body. We realize that, as an old Navy man, a graduate of Annapolis he naturally would want to reenter the service and join the armed forces. Therefore, reluctant as we are to see him go, we honor him for his choice, and we do wish him the best of luck. We trust when the war is over he will return to us safely, either as a Delegate to this great body in which he has rendered such fine service, or perhaps as Governor of his own beloved islands.

Mr. KING. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING. Yes.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Delegate from Hawaii has spoken of the success he has had in connection with certain legislation affecting Hawaii. The record shows that the gentleman's statements in that regard are very modest. My experience with the gentleman is that he himself deserves a great deal of credit for that success, because he has very vigorously attended to the legislation in which he was interested, and upon leaving the Congress he should find much satisfaction in knowing that he has done a fine job representing his constituents. All of us shall miss the gentleman greatly.

Mr. KING. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that any man at any time from any place could have represented beautiful Hawaii, with all its many important interests, with a greater degree of efficiency and faithfulness than has the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. KING].

The fidelity with which Hon. SAMUEL W. KING has represented his constituents is a matter of public record. It is a record of achievement of which he may well be proud.

I do not hesitate to say that by the force of our colleague's character and ability he has added to the prestige of all of those whom he has had the honor to represent. It is my firm belief that the influence of our friend Hon. SAMUEL W. KING will continue to be a potent factor in favor of all future legislation which may come before Congress relating to the welfare of the people of Hawaii. It is to the credit of the people of Hawaii that they fully recognized and appreciated the sterling qualities of their distinguished Delegate by sending him 8 consecutive years to speak for them on the floor of the greatest legislative body in the world.

It is typical of the high character and patriotism of our colleague that in the hour of his country's peril he should decide to return to the Navy in which he served with distinction during the First World War.

I am only one of many in the official life of Washington who regret that our good friend Sam and his most charming and cultured family cannot remain with us, but it is my hope and it is the hope of a host of other sincere friends of Delegate KING and his delightful family that their separation from us will be only for the duration and that the duration will be short.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Utah.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the gentleman from Hawaii, and to the House that I have served on one committee with the delegate from Hawaii. I think the people of Hawaii are losing one of the ablest legislators who has served in this House during the 10 years I have been here. I feel that the United States Congress is losing an able man. I appreciate the fact that on very many problems which have been before the Committee on the Territories the gentleman from Hawaii and I have sometimes been on opposite sides of the table and have had divergent views on the problem under consideration, but he has always manifested extreme fairness. With his unusual ability and his great force of argument, he has been able to convince the people with whom he has been dealing that his cause had at least one very important side, and he has usually been able to convince not only a majority of the committee, but all members of the committee, that his side was right.

I want to tell the gentleman that the people you have represented so ably will miss your presence in this body, and the Members of this body will also miss you.

We do not like to see you go, but we hope you will enjoy yourself in the work you have now chosen, and we all take consolation in the fact that you will still be in the service of our country.

Mr. KING. The gentleman from Utah is very kind.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING. I will be glad to yield if I have time.

Mr. HOPE. I have had an excellent opportunity to observe the diligence and ability with which the gentleman from Hawaii has represented his constituency during the time he has been a Member of this body. During all of that time we have served together on the Committee on Agriculture. The principal industry of Hawaii is agriculture. Our distinguished friend has done an outstanding job in his representation of this great industry. His knowledge of the needs of his people and his persuasiveness in presenting his viewpoint and position have been of untold benefit to the Territory and its people.

The Delegate from Hawaii has no vote in this body. What he accomplishes must be by the force of his personality and by his ability to convince others of the merits of his contentions. Our friend possesses these qualities in a remarkable degree. He is an able legislator whose ability is reflected in the results which he has secured. He has endeared himself to all of us. No Member of this body has more friends. We can only reconcile our sorrow at his leaving us by the thought that he will still continue in the service of his country in a capacity where his ability and experience will be of great value. He will distinguish himself in war as he has in peace. We wish him God-speed and good fortune.

Mr. KING. I thank the gentleman from Kansas very greatly.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING. I gladly yield to my distinguished friend from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I regret very much to see the gentleman from Hawaii leave this body, but I know that he is going into a service of his Government where he can be of very constructive value. I am satisfied that our friend SAM KING will lead the way into Tokyo.

Mr. KING. Of course, I might say to the gentleman that nothing would please me more than to be in the van in the parade to Tokyo.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. SAM KING has the love and respect of all Members of the House and Senate, just as he has had the love and affection of his fine constituency. I do not know of any man since I came to the Congress who has better served his constituents than our friend, Delegate KING. His services will be missed. The many kindnesses and courtesies which he has shown to us are only exemplified by his noble spirit and his endeavor to perform a very important task in taking care of all the affairs of the people of Hawaii.

When he leaves here we want to wish him aloha and Godspeed in anything he may do and hope that some day SAM KING

will be back with us in the House of Representatives.

In saying farewell to our friend from Hawaii I also desire to add a personal aloha for Mrs. King, his gracious and charming wife. Those of us who have had the pleasure of becoming acquainted with Delegate and Mrs. King feel sad over their departure from Washington, but we are happy in the knowledge that we can count on the everlasting friendship of this truly American couple. Aloha to our friends.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much. I had not intended to inspire this second wave of eulogies, but I do appreciate the kind sentiments expressed by all of you. Although I do leave with regret, I know you will appreciate that I am looking forward with a great deal of pleasure to putting on the uniform that I wore for nearly 20 years. Thank you all, and aloha.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Hawaii has expired.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is recognized for 25 minutes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a statement, and I also ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I shall now make.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARNESS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to permit me to submit a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. HARNESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the other special orders of the day I may address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AN APPRAISAL OF THE LAST ELECTION

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the Seventy-seventh Congress is drawing to a close. It has been the Congress that declared the United States at war with the Axis Powers. It has held office during a part of what is unquestionably one of the greatest turning points in all the history of mankind.

VICTORY WILL BE WON

At the moment and as long as the war lasts the future of our country rests primarily with the men and the commanders of our Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps. There have been those who have criticized their work and predicted dire consequences for the arms of America. Their tongues are silent today. They know, as the rest of us know, that the military forces of America are doing their primary part of this total war job true to the best traditions of America's naval and military history.

When the war will be won no man can predict. Some have apparently assumed that the occupation of French North Africa brought us to within easy striking distance of the final victory. I am afraid they have misled the people. That

occupation was a brilliant maneuver—brilliantly executed. It may well bring our forces to a vantage point from which telling blows may be struck. It is not in and of itself such a blow.

That such blows will be struck and that they will ultimately shatter the military power of the Axis is our confident faith. When that time will come we do not know. All we as common citizens can know is that every possible effort must be bent to bring the war to the speediest possible victory.

REASONS FOR OUTCOME OF ELECTION

Meanwhile, on November 3, there took place one of the important elections of American history. It has been interpreted in as many different ways as there are interpreters.

Of one thing, however I feel certain. The action of the voters was not a demand that reactionary policies were to be pursued. Rather it was an expression of the will of the American people that their Government draw closer to them, that it demonstrate a greater understanding of their real spirit and attitude, that it repose greater responsibility on them in their local communities, that it come closer to demanding equality of sacrifice for all, that it prosecute the war with greater efficiency and less confusion, that it anticipate problems and maladjustments instead of waiting until popular demand becomes so great that action on the part of the Government is forced by it.

FOR WINNING THE WAR THERE HAS TO BE CONCENTRATION OF RESPONSIBILITY AND UNIFICATION OF ECONOMIC COMMAND

Perhaps also the elections in part reflect the fact that many men and women have begun to feel that governmental power in itself is likely to take from people certain things of greater value than what it can give. They have seen anew the value of freedom, of constitutional democracy as a form of government, and they are now engaged in the most tremendous task perhaps in all the history of human politics and thought, namely, the task of attempting to reconcile liberty on the one hand with a reasonably decent security for the common man on the other. In a nutshell that is the task this generation of Americans must perform and they must perform it promptly enough so that the issue of this great conflict will not be lost and the sacrifice of our people and the other peoples engaged with us will not be wasted.

But if I am correct that this was in part the feeling of the people in this election, then I would add a note of warning. For one fact is perfectly obvious—neither this Nation nor any other nation can possibly fight a total war without a profound disturbance in its normal way of living; nor can any democratic people effectively meet the challenge of totalitarian nations in war without organizing their own production and economic activity in the most complete possible way.

The determination of Members of Congress and of the people generally to prevent the growth of governmental agencies and powers is a healthy sign for the future of America, but it cannot safely determine our action at the pres-

ent time. For there simply is no way to match the power of the totalitarian nations unless there is concentration of both responsibility and authority in the hands of governmental agencies, which can streamline and mobilize the resources of our country in an altogether effective way for the prosecution of this war. It is our evident duty to see that such power is not abused or arbitrarily exercised and deliberate duplication and unnecessary personnel be eliminated. To oppose such a giving of authority to selected and responsible agencies at the present time may well result in a weakening of the war effort. Rather should we insist on an increasing simplification of the line of command of our economic effort on the home front and upon a removal of the confusion which has existed in the past due to a duplication of authority between various agencies and sometimes to a competition between various governmental agencies for the use of production facilities, for materials, for manpower, and in numerous other ways.

We must fight the war through to victory, and we have got to do all things necessary to that end. Our convictions and desires with regard to the time when peace shall return will be no less profound or effective then if we recognize the necessities of this total war and concentrate our every effort upon winning it.

This speech, however, is intended as a forward look, not a backward one. All I shall have to say is said on the assumption that the war comes first in all of our considerations. My remarks are an attempt—and I hope an important one—to appraise the situation in which we now find ourselves and to help to build some of that hope upon which the spiritual and moral strength of our people, as well as those of other nations, must ultimately depend. For it is not to enthrone old and outworn privileges that this war is being fought. No. It is being fought by people in order that they may know and that their children may know a better day than mankind has ever seen. Never can we lose sight of this fact, nor the companion fact, which is that this is not simply a military conflict, but more than that is a great contest between two diametrically opposite systems of life and government for the allegiance of people throughout the world. To truly win this war, therefore, will require the giving to those people of a basis for hope of a world society in which a Hitler will be impossible and in which exploitation of one people by another will be ended.

The election just passed has not changed the fundamental forces that move through the hearts and minds of the American electorate.

It has not altered the ideals they cherish nor the hopes for the future that lead people to make the sacrifices of war without complaint.

TWO BASIC DEMANDS OF THE PEOPLE

The people are still saying:

"Two things this war must produce—

"First. A lasting peace—so that war shall not return upon the next generation of young men.

"Second. The growth and the development of the democratic way of life and the American ideal of equality of opportunity for every class and group and kind of people."

The importance of political developments in America in the next 2 years will be found not in whether sitting Members of Congress are returned to office but in whether the destinies of our country are guided by men who are committed without reservation to accomplishing at the close of this war what was not accomplished at the close of the First World War.

The future of America and all she has stood for through the years will hang in the balance and be determined by what is done by whomsoever guides our ship of state in the period just after the war.

Pure oppositionism frequently wins elections—especially in times of trouble and hardship for the people.

But it is a weak reed indeed upon which to depend for the rebuilding of the whole world.

I shall not attempt to draw blueprints of world organizations or to describe how I believe machinery should be set up for the solution of future international problems.

Those problems will not all be solved in a moment of time.

But I shall say one thing: Those who seek the support of the American electorate in the months immediately ahead owe to that electorate straight-out answers to these questions: Is it proposed that America shall play her full part in building the peace that must follow this war? Is it proposed that this Nation shall help actively to prevent a repetition of the tragic series of events that intervened between the two wars? Is it proposed that we shall remember only Pearl Harbor? Or is it proposed that we shall remember also the League of Nations and Manchuria and Ethiopia and Hitler's march into the Rhineland?

To those questions the American people will expect an answer. May it be the right answer from whomever they select to govern this Nation in 1944.

PEACE DEPENDS ON FREE DEMOCRATIC GOVERNMENT AND FREE GOVERNMENT DEPENDS ON SOLUTION OF ECONOMIC PROBLEMS

But it is not alone a matter of the peace treaty that will be at stake. There is a basis and root for peace. Peace can only be secure among peoples who are free. And the freedom of peoples within their own nations depends, directly, as the history of the past 2 decades amply demonstrates, upon whether or not the economic problems of the people can and will be solved by democratic and free governments and without the sacrifice of liberty. Three great things human beings have always sought. Three instructive urges have been put into us by Him who made us.

First. The will to live—to sustain life—the search for food, clothing, shelter for oneself and family.

Second. Security and safety in these things—peace and the opportunity to live out one's life fully.

Third. Freedom of the spirit. And as civilization advances men and women put more and more value on the third of these things.

Totalitarian governments arose because clever and ambitious men persuaded the people of certain nations that by the sacrifice of their freedom they could gain jobs and food and security.

And by the same token the strength and safety of free and constitutional government upon which in turn our hope of peace depends are only to be found in proving to one's own people and to the world that freedom and security are not incompatible and that there can be full employment and jobs for all within the framework of a society of freemen.

In the next Congress there will be need as there has not been for a decade for men who will not be afraid to speak out on behalf of the common people, the poor, and those whom it is easy to forget. There will be need of men who, though they constitute a decided minority of the membership, will tell the story of the unsung heroism of ordinary Americans of every race and kind on the battlefield, in the shops, on the farms, and on the highways of the world. There will be need of Members who will constantly be showing their colleagues the fundamental truth of democratic life and government which is that it is not the rich or the great or the powerful who ultimately compose a Nation's strength in either war or peace but rather the great silent army of men and women who through the ages have paid the price in blood and sweat and tears and who have never asked for more than a chance to live and earn a decent and fairly secure competence for themselves and their families. This group of men will be important. For our work will be that of building the hope of millions who are called upon to bear the burden and heat of the battle, and the war effort at home. The time has come, I believe, when it must be said in plain and simple words that the hope of the people can be rested neither in the establishment of governmental bureaus and the extension of centralized governmental controls which the New Deal in certain phases has meant nor, certainly, in the chronic and wholly negative opposition to the New Deal which has characterized the forces of reaction throughout the country and within the Congress.

This war is being fought first to destroy the greatest threat to human liberty and decency, to the right of people to call their souls their own that the world has ever known. But like all periods of great suffering it has got to issue into a better and more hopeful world for all sorts and conditions of men. To believe that the onerous controls and executive governmental powers which this war has brought upon the people of America are going to be perpetuated is to deny the existence of every strong current of popular feeling in this Nation and to overlook what I judge to be the strongest passion of the overwhelming majority of the Congress. But to propose that as an alternative the people

be told that they can no longer look for any sort of wise and constructive action from their Government to protect the weak and restrain the strong, to motivate full production and employment, to use its taxing and its monetary powers to assure producers—especially farmers—of a full market for their products—to say that none of these things will be done, but that we shall simply return after the war to a vacuous nirvana of normalcy, wherein the devil will again have license to take the hindmost in every economic race, that indeed is a gospel of despair.

THE MIDDLE ROAD

There is another way—a golden mean if you will. It is a way whereby both freedom and security can in reasonable degree be achieved in our country. It is to be distinguished from some aspects of the New Deal in that it will emphasize the motivation of full production and employment by dynamic measures, but will avoid to the greatest possible extent measures which involve direction or control of the economic life of the people by Government agencies and bureaus. Its principal tasks will be monetary and fiscal ones, though it will never neglect for an hour the basic duty of any democratic government which is to break the hold of irresponsible monopoly power over any aspect of the people's lives.

And so now I come to what I may call a sort of confession of my political faith. I believe that freedom and decent security for the people are not incompatible. I believe it is possible to find and apply with salutary effect the proper functions of government in the solution of economic problems without extending either governmental power over the people or causing them to become dependent upon paternalistic action by government. I believe the achievement and maintenance of a state of abundant production in peacetime is possible if it is based on a resolute maintenance of a proper balance between that production and a full free flow of consumer buying power. The one rule that must never be departed from is this—whenever the potential supply of needed goods and services exceeds the demand for them then the demand should always be increased, and under no circumstances should the supply be artificially reduced.

OUTLINE OF PROGRAM FOR ECONOMIC HEALTH AFTER WAR

Full employment, abundant production, and equally abundant consumption can be achieved without governmental economic dictatorship or governmental direction and control of our economy. The job of Government must be the motivation of full employment and production, not by increasing governmental power but by consistently, effectually, and regularly passing that power on into the hands of the 130,000,000 people of the Nation. In the first line of economic defense belong, therefore, such measures as will make certain that American consumers will have a constant buying power large enough in total volume to keep our machinery of production going at a high enough level to provide full employment. Such measures include: First, creation

by the Nation itself of such additional money or national credit as is required by expanding production, thus ending the present practice of borrowing the Nation's own credit at interest from private banks; second, amendment of the Social Security Act so as to make it a dynamic force channeling otherwise idle buying power into the active stream of consumer demand instead of a static individual insurance program; third, the fearless use of taxation as a means of penalizing the arch crime of a free economic order, namely, holding the medium of exchange out of use; fourth, measures which will assure the farmer that the abundance of his production will not be the measure of his woe but rather that he will find a full home market among those who, to put it simply and undramatically, need more food; and, finally, fifth, use of publicly owned yardsticks to break the grip of monopoly in fields of natural monopoly such as electric power and the vigorous enforcement of antitrust laws to accomplish the same purpose in fields where competition is possible as the method of protecting the public interest. And there is always the hope that the cooperative movement among consumers, farmers, and other groups will—without Government favors or subsidy of any kind—attain sufficient economic strength to exert the sort of salutary influence on our economic life that it has exerted in Scandinavia. If these things are done, we will develop a clear distinction between the proper fields of governmental action in a democracy and the phases of economic life in which Government will not enter. And every one of the measures I have briefly suggested will stimulate greater economic activity and afford increased economic opportunity to the people generally.

Democracy can be defined as a state where the rights of individuals are determined by law and custom, and not by the arbitrary decisions of an individual or a special group. It is important to remember this.

The key to the building of a world of both freedom and security after the war is to be found in the difference between two different kinds of governmental action and policy. On the one hand are those measures which make citizens depend upon government; on the other are measures which open to citizens the way to help themselves. On the one hand are measures which give to Government departments or bureaus actual and intimate control over the economic activity and business of the people as a means of attempts to solve their problems such as unemployment; on the other hand are measures whereby the economic activity of the Nation as a whole is stimulated in dynamic fashion so that none need go without a job. The difference is between direction and control, on the one hand, and dynamic motivation of full employment and full production on the other.

One example of this difference is to be found in the field of prices. The kind of price control we have today—and which, in view of the circumstances of this war period, is necessary—leads inevitably to

the building up of a great enforcement organization, to constant interference and interposition by the Government in the business of millions of American citizens. This kind of price control cannot be had without a very considerable amount of bureaucratic control.

There is another way, one that has never been sincerely tried. It is the method of so controlling the total volume of money in circulation as to keep a constant and stable relationship between that volume of money and the flow of goods through the markets of the Nation. Most important of all—in peacetime—it is required, if we would use this method, that a nonpolitical public body composed of outstanding citizens and created as an agency of the Congress have and exercise the power of creating money and employing, without increasing debt, the national credit of the American people. Use that power, Mr. Speaker, and you can maintain the over-all buying power of the Nation in such manner as to support a market that will be large enough to keep our people employed. Furthermore, over a period of time the national debt of the American people can in this manner be gradually reduced without bringing on a constriction of economic activity by overburdensome taxation.

The one essential economic task of government then, according to my belief, is to give a virtual guaranty to the producers of the Nation that the demand of consumers for their products will not fail. And this need not increase the power and authority of government. It can be accomplished by the passing on in accordance with laws of Congress of economic power to the 130,000,000 people of America. For example, if in the face of threatening unemployment we set up a huge emergency work program—as we shall have certainly to do if we do not develop another answer beforehand—then it becomes inevitable that the power of giving or withholding jobs and employment as to many American citizens will rest with a group of governmental officials. Again there is another way. Suppose the idea of social security were extended until we had established a system of old-age pensions for all classes and groups and all sections of the Nation, as well as a system of insurance for the protection of the disabled, the parentless child, and the widowed mother. Then, according to law, we should have a means of sustaining on a reasonable basis the buying power of these citizens in our midst who cannot or properly should not be employed. It gives to government no economic power over the people to pay an old-age pension. No; it passes on to people in every corner of the Nation the economic power that resides ultimately in the Nation as a whole.

MONOPOLY POWER VERSUS FREEDOM

But I believe it is quite impossible for us to achieve both freedom and security for the people of this Nation in the future unless irresponsible monopoly power, wherever it raises its head, is subjected to the most effective and relentless measures by the Government for the purpose of protecting the rank-and-file American citizen from its operations.

In saying this, I have reference first to monopoly finance with its control over the industrial life of America, and to monopoly industry with its power to block the opportunity of the small man to engage in particular lines of business and its even more dangerous power to artificially restrict production and hold prices at unjustifiable high levels. But I also have reference to monopoly power of small numbers of people within organizations of any sort over the fate of great numbers of people who must make their living in this country. The Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice under Mr. Thurman Arnold has made an earnest effort to enforce the law, to break monopoly power, and to protect the opportunities and rights not only of all businessmen but also of other American citizens. The work of this Division has never received the kind of wholehearted support which it should have had from other branches of the Government. In the future, after this war has been won, it must have that kind of support. For to permit monopoly power to stand and still to talk about freedom is nothing short of hypocritical, whereas to free all the forces of production and progress is the very essence of democracy. It may require some sort of major operation for us to reconstitute the small businesses of this country after the experience of this war. In my humble judgment, our task would be rendered much less difficult if decisions with regard to production programs for the war were not so largely in the hands of representatives of the largest businesses and in many cases the greatest monopolies in this whole Nation. Nevertheless, we must pick up the problem from where it stands at the end of the war, doing meanwhile what we can to mitigate the fate of the small business people. Unless, however, these small business firms can be got back on their feet and into active operation again after the war, we shall face a problem most severe in its magnitude, and one which possibly may spell the end of any true economic freedom in this country.

Another thing which must be done in this particular field also, in my judgment, is that there must be legislation on the statute books of our country—and I believe it should be put there now—which would render it illegal for anyone to restrict the use of patented processes by others. The first step in this direction is contained in legislation already before this body and introduced by myself. It was introduced in the Senate by the senior Senator from Illinois. All this legislation seeks to do is to make it an offense for anyone to restrict interstate commerce by unreasonably refusing to grant licenses for the use of patented processes.

The function of Government in protecting the weak and restraining the strong is one of its most important duties, according to my belief. This duty it must not flinch from in the years that lie ahead. It must make certain that the rank and file of all types of organizations, whether they be organizations of farmers, businessmen, or la-

borers, are in a position to actually control the destinies, the policies, and the operations of those organizations. This, it seems to me, is the constructive approach to many of these problems, which unfortunately some Members of the Congress have attempted to deal with by means of various types of penal statutes, which inevitably will do more harm than good.

A FULL MARKET FOR FARMERS AND HEALTH FOR CHILDREN

I believe in the American family-sized farm. I think that the small, independent farmer has always been, both in this country and in other countries, the very backbone of a democratic society. But I believe that certain measures for his protection have got to be taken, not measures that will increase the power of Government over him but measures that will prevent economic forces beyond his control from driving him to the wall. I believe he has a right to be assured of a fair, full market for the abundance which he can produce. We have got to be done with situations where we say in effect that, though an abundance of food has been produced by our farmers and though there is still need and hunger in this and other lands, nevertheless we are not intelligent enough to know how to bring this food and the hungry people together. I can conceive of a program whereby we would say that we were going to do away with undernourishment among all the school children of this Nation, and where we would purchase from these farmers, at a fair cost of production price, those products of food which they had produced and which would mean so much to the balancing of the nutrition and to the health of the children of this great Nation. Here, again, I would handle such a program, not through Federal hand-outs to anybody but only as is now done, through local groups of people who sponsor the program and arrange for the use of the food in a fair and just manner. But I would do this job on a scale so that it would reach all children throughout this Nation. After all, it is hardly reasonable to believe that a child that has had insufficient nourishment can take advantage of the fine educational system which our country boasts. The maintenance of decent prices for agricultural commodities to the farmer is a better and more constructive way to meet his problem than by giving him benefit payments from the Federal Treasury. But it will not be right merely to stop the benefit payments unless we are prepared to put something better in their place. By means of the method I have already suggested, as well as others, we should make certain that the abundance of the farmer's production will not be his destruction, but rather the means of enabling him to feel that he is building up a stronger and healthier nation and, indeed, a stronger and healthier world recognized for 25 minutes.

HOPE IN COOPERATION

And there are scattered through this Nation at this very hour far-sighted and earnest men and women who without the slightest help from Government in any way are working out the answer to their

problems as farmers, consumers, borrowers and savers, users of electricity, and purchasers of insurance by the method of cooperation. Their work is to me one of the brightest stars of hope that we can see through the darkness of this war.

As best I knew how I have worked through my three terms in Congress for the rights and interest of the common people of America. I shall not lay that work down however the winds of political fortune may blow. I have worked for the opportunity of people to work and earn a living, for the solution of unemployment, for the removal of the burden of unnecessary debt from the shoulders of the people. To these things I shall continue to be dedicated.

The time has come, not in spite of but because of the war that engulfs the world, for clear statements by us all of the things we shall seek to accomplish in tomorrow's world—a world being born out of the travail of this war.

The time has also come when old political shibboleths and phrases must be discarded and when men must stand forth for principles and policies which they can state clearly so the people can understand and judge.

In this hour of crisis for our country the thing most needed it seems to me is a straightforward and forthright movement among the people for the establishment as a result of this war of simple justice between nations and of true equality of opportunity among the citizens of our country. Nor does such a movement need to employ the methods of governmental bureaucracy to gain its ends. There are other and better ways as I have shown. If we interpret the outcome of the last election as a mandate from the American people to attempt to turn the hands of time backward and to commit our Nation for a second time to some kind of impossible laissez-faire normalcy after this war has been won we shall not only misconstrue the temper and spirit of the people but we shall deal a body blow to the true cause of the United Nations in this war.

That we must not do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE] is recognized for 25 minutes.

A FORESTRY PROGRAM

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker—

I think that I shall never see
A poem lovely as a tree.
A tree whose hungry mouth is pressed
Against the earth's sweet flowing breast.
A tree that may in summer wear
A nest of robins in her hair;
Upon whose bosom snow has lain,
Who intimately lives with rain.
Poems are made by fools like me,
But only God can make a tree.

—Joyce Kilmer.

The author has made a deep impression upon all nature lovers who have read his beautiful lines quoted above. In early boyhood, along the banks of the Illinois River, I learned to love and admire the stately walnut trees and the butternut trees, for in the fall they bore nuts that I enjoyed. The white oaks looked to me like monstrous growths. As

a young man I moved toward the West. I learned to admire the forests of Colorado, uncut as they were 60 years ago. Then I found my home in the great Pacific Northwest, and admired the ponderosa pine of the high plateaus, the Douglas fir, the cedar of the coast range, and finally it was my pleasure to see and wonder at the redwoods of California and southern Oregon. I shall never forget my many visits to the Port Orford cedars of the Pacific coast. Much of that unique stand has now been harvested and been purchased by the Japanese Government. It lies buried in the bays of that far-seeing kingdom, to be brought forth years in the future, to enter the channels of commerce. When Governor of the State of Oregon, I took every opportunity to visit the forests that I might see the trees in their primitive beauty—one of God's great gifts to man.

ORIGINAL FOREST SETTING

It is a little more than three centuries since our ancestors crossed the stormy Atlantic, often taking many weeks of ocean travel before they could commence their settlements on the Atlantic border. At that time, the forests extended to the water's edge. I have taken great pleasure in visiting the historic spots along the Atlantic coast, among them Jamestown, where the English established their first permanent settlement in 1607. I have stood upon the very ground where those English pioneers are said to have landed. The settlers tried to find a place where the water was deep clear up to the bank, with strong trees close, so they could tie their ships when they were unloading their cargo. They found such conditions at the mouth of the James River and made their settlement at a place which became Jamestown. You can still see the original trees, or their successors, standing close to the water's edge. In memory you can see those brave men throwing the ropes around the trees that held their little vessels as their cargo was discharged.

America, at that time, was the most beautifully forested land on all this earth. Mile upon mile of white oak, black walnut, beech, and other valuable varieties were strewn with great profusion along the Atlantic coast, from the Gulf far into Canada. In the southland were beautiful forests of native woods. In the Mississippi Valley there were patches here and there of open prairie, but many of their farms our ancestors hewed out of the dense forests. The Great Plains, the short-grass country at the foot of the Rockies, the forested lands of the high altitude of the Continental Divide, and then the traveler to the West would enter the magnificent forests of the Pacific coast—such a heritage as was never before passed on to humankind. Think that those forests existed, almost in their virgin beauty, only a century ago!

It is true our ancestors along the Atlantic coast cut into the forests an average of about a mile a year, so when the Revolutionary War came, the Colonies had reached back in their roads and their cleared patches, about a hundred and fifty miles. There were a few primitive sawmills eating into what seemed inexhaustible forests—east of the Alleghanies.

THE KING'S SHIPMASTS

Historians of the colonial period state that, prior to the Revolutionary War, representatives of the governments of Europe realized the value of the straight, perfect pines of New England for shipmasts. For several years the shipmasts which supplied the warships of western Europe came out of New England, along with the planks that they used on the decks of those warships. That was a period of time when the wind and sails were the only means of propelling the ships of war which were, even then, trying to annihilate each other.

CIVIL LAW AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Coming out of Rome is what students know as the civil law. That system of legal procedure established a principle that no title could be given to any person or company for that which lay beneath the surface of the ground; hence, the coal beds, the ore, the iron, the oil, natural resources hidden beneath the surface of the earth were reserved for all the people wherever the civil law operated. No such resources were subject to private exploitation. It is for this reason that the Mexican Government refuses to recognize the claims of the foreign oil operators for the immense sums they demand as damages for being obliged to give up their oil reservoirs in Mexico. Had this wise law been extended at an earlier date to cover the forests of America, what a beautiful heritage it would have left to this generation and to those who are to come. I do not mean to prevent proper use of the forest but I do mean to protect young growth, harvesting trees as a crop, and not mining, wrecking, burning, and destroying the forests as private enterprise destroys them in greedy haste to pile up wealth.

PRIVATE EXPLOITATION

In the early days of this Republic, the greedy, selfish few whose minds were fixed on dividends and profits took advantage of the struggling government and acquired great areas of forested lands, starting in Maine, before the Revolutionary day, building on the inventive genius of America that seemed to spring into new life after this Government came into existence. After the American Revolution and up to World War No. 1 the timbermen tore, cut, and burned their way across the continent, through New England, the Lake States, through the Southland, into the Rocky Mountains, following the railroads. Yes; cutting, tearing to pieces, burning and destroying forests as they moved westward.

Now, into the Nation's last stand of virgin timber, in the Pacific Northwest, you can follow the path by the barren lands, the ghost towns, the stranded farmers. You can read in the literature of northern Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, the results of private destruction of the forests. Those miners, slaughterers, perhaps we ought to say "timbermen," took the cream of the forests, forcing their way over the mountains, driving abundant game before them, leaving perhaps along a public road a half mile of original trees, beyond which was mile upon mile of scarred mountain slopes, disfigured and ruined by erosion, often partly burned stumps. I must not forget

that a weak effort for reforestation was made here and there but the Joint Congressional Committee, of which I was a member, found that reforestation had not really taken a hold. Little evidence did that investigating committee find that there would be abundant wood supplies left for generations yet to come. The committee found that exploitation of the private forests was the general rule.

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT MUST ACT

We have now reached a place where the Federal Government must take a hold, whatever be the cost and whatever be the necessary laws. We must pass into a period of Federal regulation and control, or we will pass into an age of scarcity of lumber instead of abundance—not only for future generations but the generation that is now coming onto the stage. Action can no longer be delayed if we are to enjoy forests in the United States.

PRIVATE OWNERSHIP IN TIMBER

Private ownership of large tracts of timber by absentee owners has been a primary factor in making it impossible to regulate cutting and insure reforestation. I am a firm believer in private enterprise, but not in water power, coal beds, oil reserves, or forests. In these natural resources, the whole community has a vested interest. The whole Nation has a stake in every forest and in every growing tree with the right to act for protection of its interest.

ENEMIES OF THE FOREST—FIRE

Fire is a great enemy of the forest. It is true that the pioneers in an early day often set fires for the purpose of cleaning up the underbrush so that they might see the Indians or that they might have a cleared patch on which to grow corn or pumpkins. Our investigating committee found that even now in the South the men owning cattle like to burn off the forests to get clean, green grass for their herds, forgetting the young trees that are often destroyed in such a fire. I have often heard the early pioneers say a fire is simply nature's method of cleaning up the back yard. Millions of trees have been destroyed by lightning. This destruction by nature can be greatly curtailed if active efforts are put forth to extinguish the fires.

Within recent years Federal and State Governments have established methods of preventing and controlling the forest fires. Three-fourths of the forest area today is protected. Watchers in towers erected at strategic points spot the starting of a fire and call upon the workers to extinguish it. Miles of telephone wires have been strung so that help and fire-fighting apparatus may be called. Airplanes have been brought into use, dropping men and food and fire-fighting apparatus close to the fire. Appropriations are entirely too meager even though the Congress has voted large sums for the purpose. The Joint Congressional Investigating Committee recommended that not to exceed \$10,000,000 a year be appropriated for fire protection and public control. This should be done without delay, but I would have the control exercised by the Federal Government.

The most disastrous forest fire of recent times occurred in Wisconsin at the same time Chicago burned, October 1871. Fifteen hundred people lost their lives in that fire, and more than a million acres were burned over. The disastrous Tillamook fire of 1933 in Oregon is treated in another speech I made on the 10th of December. It was preventable and caused by negligence of private operators. It destroyed \$200,000,000 worth of virgin timber.

FOREST DESTRUCTION BY INSECTS

Insects have destroyed millions of trees; they seem to thrive best on mature and unhealthy trees and during periods of great drought. When nature sends its insects, every effort should be made by man to counteract the resultant destruction as rapidly as possible. Appropriations by the Congress for insect control should be ample, so Federal officials can work with planned programs and efficiency, knowing they will not be hampered by lack of funds.

WE ARE A WOOD-USING PEOPLE

People in our country are naturally a wood-using people. We want wood to build our homes and other buildings, we want wood for fencing; we use wood in our industries. We burn wood for warmth. We have always had and enjoyed an abundance of wood. The early settlers, from ocean to ocean, when they went into a new country, first looked for two things in choosing a place of settlement—it must be in close proximity to wood and water. The research laboratories have now taught us how to use the waste wood—the small pieces—and this work must be furthered.

GROWING OF TREES IS A NATION'S JOB

The growing of most forests is a long-time job—often that of a lifetime, or even more. Forests occur in nearly all of our States. Every State and every person in every State has a vital interest in the forests of every other State. We have learned through long years of bitter experience that we cannot depend upon private owners to do the forest job that must be done in the public interest. It is equally true that we cannot depend upon separate action, or the lack of action, or the widely divergent action, of 48 different States.

The Federal Government, representing the whole Nation, must take the leadership in what is the Nation's job. More forest lands will have to come back into public ownership. The Federal Government must lead in bringing that about. Destruction of the forests on privately owned land must be stopped forthwith. Why delude ourselves into thinking that 48 States can or will do what no State ever has done, even as its forest wealth has disappeared? Only the Federal Government can carry out the whole forest program; it is emphatically the Nation's responsibility.

We shall have to have Federal leadership also if we are going to make real progress on the other measures which I have been discussing today; those measures which are included in the recommendations of the joint congressional committee.

ANNUAL HARVEST AND GROWTH

Although it is true that almost half of our commercial forest land is classified as saw timber, much of this has been culled over, or is small, second growth, and of inferior quality. One-sixth of the total commercial forest area is either barren of tree growth or so poorly restocked that it will not again without long delay produce a commercial crop.

The present timber resource of the United States is a little more than 500,000,000,000 cubic feet. To the annual cut of about 15,000,000,000 cubic feet, including both saw timber and cord wood, must be added 2,000,000,000 for destruction by fire, insects, and disease, so that the total annual drain on our forests is almost 17,000,000,000 cubic feet, or about one-thirtieth of the stand. Against this, current annual growth is estimated at about 11,000,000,000 cubic feet. The shortage in growth as compared to the drain is more marked for sawtimber alone, where the drain is almost double the growth. The discrepancy is still more marked when the element of quality is considered.

Lumber industry spokesmen have frequently cited mid-depression figures, with drain only 2,000,000,000 cubic feet in excess of annual growth, to show that there is no danger of a timber famine. We want to maintain activity in the forest industries at a higher level than prevailed in 1936, and we cannot do so if we continue to deplete the forest capital which is needed to produce usable growth. To balance our forest budget on a national scale without drastic curtailment of consumption of forest products, we must build up and maintain in all forested regions an adequate base of productive growing stock. Only in the Douglas fir and redwood forests of the Pacific Coast do we still have a reserve of virgin timber which may be reduced without an adverse effect upon future productivity.

The Joint Congressional Committee on Forestry, in its various meetings, encountered everywhere a demand for more money for fire protection. But the private commercial interests were not concerned about protection of the forests from destructive cutting. They demanded that the Federal Government should let them alone. They wanted no interference or regulation of cutting practices on their lands. At every meeting of timbermen this stand was reiterated.

ABUNDANCE VERSUS SCARCITY

Private interests which quote figures something like those in the preceding paragraphs evidently look forward to a day when timber will be scarce and prices high. The public is interested in an abundant supply and a reasonable price. The flaw in the reasoning of the commercial interests, as represented by highly financed lobbies in the Nation's Capital, is that the growth is not in saw timber. The saw timber is being exhausted at a very rapid rate. Even in the next 15 years many of the sawmills in Oregon will have to cease operations because they will have exhausted the

original or virgin growth, and all too little arrangement has been made to provide a second growth for future generations. The parting of the ways is right here. Following one road we will, as a Nation, increase only the values of private holdings and the riches of their owners. This road leads to scarcity in timber supplies, and much higher prices. We should start down the other road toward an abundant supply of timber at reasonable prices which people can afford to pay, with provision for permanent forests. In retiring from the Congress, I warn my colleagues that now is the time to act if they would preserve for future generations an abundant wood supply, such as we have previously enjoyed and which has been so ruthlessly destroyed.

NO TAX ON A GROWING FOREST CROP

I recall, when Governor of the State of Oregon, I announced in a discussion of the timber question that no tax should be levied on a growing forest. During the years that have elapsed since I made that statement, which raised a storm of protest in Oregon, I have become more convinced than ever that my original statement was right. To tax a forest, to tax a tree, means to hurry it on to the day when the woodman's ax will sever it from the ground, and it will move in to the commercial trade, even though often thrown on a glutted market. Who would think of taxing a growing crop of wheat or potatoes? Timber is certainly a crop and not a mine.

THE SEVERANCE TAX

When the tree crop is cut for market, then a tax should be levied, commensurate with the value of the crop that moves into the commercial channels. Owners of private timber will at once say, "For 40 years we have paid taxes on this crop and now you want to collect a severance tax in addition." Yes, commercial owners, and, until the new system is established, I am willing to make some reimbursement for the taxes that have been levied against your growing crop of timber. Introduction of this system would help to solve the problem of preventing forest destruction and, eventually, the severance tax would supplant other taxation of timber land.

CUT-OUT AND GET-OUT

I am unable to trace the origin of the well-known motto of private interests "Cut-out and get-out," but it has run through the beautiful forests from Maine to Oregon, and you can still see the effect of that practice, whether or not you can hear the resounding words as we did in former days. The words describe the attitude of some of the timbermen.

I remember hearing Forester Silcox tell a story of a mill that was cutting 50,000,000 feet a year and from their cutting circle could continue to cut that for all time. Then they decided to borrow a few million dollars, enlarge their operations and cut 150,000,000 feet a year and exhaust their virgin supply in about 15 years. Greed—the desire to get the benefit quickly, with no thought of the future. That has been the belief that

has gone through much of the commercial timber interests for more than a century. State or Nation should have stepped forward to put a stop to such a plan.

A SUSTAINED YIELD UNDER SELECTIVE LOGGING

By "sustained yield" we mean cutting from a forest, or from a cutting circle, only that amount of timber which growth will sustain and renew throughout the years. In October, I had the pleasure of driving through a forest in central Oregon where they were cutting only 20 percent or one-fifth of the ripest trees which were so large that the cut actually yielded 40 percent of the entire lumber supply on the land. I drove through miles of forests where such a cutting had been made 10 years before but it looked like a virgin forest. I have heard much about the reforestation by commercial timber owners. I have visited many of their forests, but I never saw anything comparable to the sustained yield cutting being done on the Federal forest reserve by the Hines Lumber Mill of Burns, Oregon.

CLEAN CUTTING

I am well aware of the fact that practical foresters have repeatedly stated that in the fir regions of western Oregon and Washington the plan of cutting only the ripe trees is not always practical, and that sometimes the Douglas-fir forests should be cut clean, and a new forest allowed to start, all at the same time. In some locations, however, the Douglas fir forests can be cut selectively, taking only the larger, older trees and leaving the younger, smaller trees for future growth. In other locations groups of the larger, more mature trees can be cut, leaving the smaller groups for future cuttings. Where clean cutting is necessary, it is always possible to leave patches of timber on the rough, rocky mountainsides, to scatter the seed for a new forest. When it is necessary to clean cut, the removal of the slashing and of the snags which abound in our Douglas-fir forests is absolutely necessary to protect the young forests from fire. Cutting is only half the job. It should be required that the area should be cleaned up to protect it against fires. Then if, for any reason, the young forest does not start, the clean-cut areas should be planted.

CUTTING AN UNRIPE TREE

I recall what a commotion I raised in a meeting of commercial timbermen by stating that I thought the time would come when it would be considered a misdemeanor to cut an unripe tree, even on a man's own land. My reasoning was that the entire community had a legitimate interest in the growing tree. Those who lived in the village, depending on the water supply of a creek for industry, those who wanted to enjoy the beauty of the tree, and those who looked to the future—all had a community interest in the tree and in the forest. It is a concern of society and its organized government to protect natural resources, and to guarantee their benefits to future generations.

PIONEERS SHOULD NOT BE BLAMED

I have heard many a pioneer say that if he had kept the hardwood grove which he found on his farm it would have been

worth more during his own lifetime than all the crops he had grown upon the land. Had that pioneer understood the reforestation problem and cut the ripe trees, he could have enjoyed a constant income therefrom and still be able to pass on to his descendants a beautiful and valuable heritage. In the early days it must have seemed as if the forests were inexhaustible.

IT IS LATER THAN YOU THINK

It is more than 60 years since I worked in a lumber mill in the mountains of Colorado. I have never lost my interest in the forest. It is my firm belief that "it is later than you think" for the preservation of our forests. One of the deep regrets I have in my closing days in the Congress of the United States is that I have not been able to do more to preserve the forests and to help create a sentiment in the National Capital which would curb destruction by the private interests and usher in the day of real forest conservation based on a guarantee of permanent abundance.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution and concurrent resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 170. Joint resolution extending until April 30, 1943, the period for which overtime rates of compensation may be paid under the acts of June 23, 1940 (54 Stat. 676), October 21, 1940 (54 Stat. 1205), and June 3, 1941 (55 Stat. 241), and for other purposes;

S. Con. Res. 41. Concurrent resolution providing for the sine die adjournment of the two Houses of Congress, and

S. Con. Res. 42. Concurrent resolution authorizing the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, notwithstanding the adjournment of the second session of the Seventy-seventh Congress, to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses of Congress which have been examined by the Committee on Enrolled Bills of each House and found truly enrolled.

The message also announced that the Senate requests the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (H. R. 5444) to amend the act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, together with the Senate engrossed amendment thereto.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

WILL BUSINESS CONTINUE TO EXIST?

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, tragic as it may seem, during this period of war when the Government spending exceeds that of any other milestone in our Nation's history, the small and the average businessman in our country is gradually being forced to the wall. Quite recently a close survey has been made in the various localities in our Nation, and the result of that survey is alarming. It is quite alarming from the standpoint of business itself, and it is very alarming from the standpoint of our own Government. In the face of this impending disaster to business of every kind we are forced to the conclusion, that if and

when business is driven to the wall and our businessmen are forced to close their doors, that great source of revenue to our Government will be entirely cut off, and the means of prosecuting the war will be greatly diminished. With those businessmen engaged in operating their various businesses, many of whom have been engaged in business for many years and with a high degree of success, the Government had a source of revenue from the many and various taxes which were imposed upon them. Those people, when engaged in business and when they were prosperous, had the opportunity to buy War bonds, stamps, and to make their contributions for every worth-while and essential project to aid in the prosecution of the war. But when they are driven out of business—and that is the very thing that is now happening—the Government loses the taxes which have heretofore been collected, it loses the sales of bonds and stamps which it would otherwise be enabled to sell, and those people are prevented from making any contribution to the many and various agencies which are now aiding in our all-out war effort.

When we analyze this frightful situation, we are forced to the conclusion that such a policy, which is now enforced by those in command of our Government, is contrary to good business, and it is very obstructive and highly detrimental to our war effort. If our people are permitted to operate their businesses at a small profit, they are able to aid our Government, they are able to employ others, they are able to take their places among those who are aiding in our war effort. As one man, in the congressional district which I have the honor to represent, stated:

If we can earn money, then we can buy bonds.

Among this class of our businessmen who are being forced to the wall, we find the farmer, the merchant, the hardware dealers, the filling-station operator, the salesmen, the small-plant operator and the manufacturer, our banks and lending agencies, and practically every class of business within our country. When all kinds of business face disaster, then the workers are directly affected because when a business closes its doors the employees are left without a job.

Thus, this deplorable condition in which business finds itself at the moment, directly and indirectly affects a large part of our population. This is a very unhealthy condition in time of war, but it has been brought about by the bureaucracy which has been built by the administration now in power, and which has now reached the proportions of a supergovernment, manned by a group of agency heads who have been appointed by the President, but who were not elected by the people, and who could never be elected to any public office, and who are responsible to but one person—the President—who appointed them to their posts. Therefore, this frightful situation rests just where it belongs—on the doorstep of the President. He alone can alter this situation. He can save the businessmen of our country if he will act. That

action must come promptly and without any uncertainty.

In the analysis which has been made throughout the country, it is of interest to note the general trend of business in the various localities. I will include only a part of those localities herewith, but a number sufficient to give the general trend of business.

In Boston, Mass., the report shows that—

Vacancies in retail stores are increasing daily.

In Detroit, Mich., the analysis made shows—

Every tendency for commercial property rentals is downward.

Out in Cleveland, Ohio, the analyst gathers the following information:

Store rents definitely down, with a considerable increase in vacancies.

While in Chicago, Ill., the report comes—

That more vacancies are occurring in office and store properties, relieving all possible pressure to increase rentals. Trend for both is downward. Office space occupancy approximately 85 percent. Industrial space no longer demanding premium prices.

And going to St. Louis, Mo., which is in the great Central and Midwest, we find the following situation:

Survey showed 3,000 stores vacant. Store rentals stationary or decreasing. Comparatively large vacancies in smaller industrial properties with a tendency to decreasing rents.

Then going to the far West, we find the report from Seattle, Wash., which states:

Commercial vacancies, especially on the ground floor, are increasing. Office vacancies approximately 10 percent.

In Denver, Colo., the analysis shows—

Vacancies increasing and in office buildings the same is 10.8 percent, which is double what it was in 1937. Office building rentals 66½ percent of the level prevailing in 1928-29, with store rentals 25 percent below that level.

And selecting another centrally located city, we refer to the report from Indianapolis, the State capital of Indiana, which report reads:

Business buildings are 15 percent vacant, office space is 11 percent vacant, and vacancies are increasing rapidly.

We might pick out another city, and we will select Des Moines, Iowa, which is rather centrally located, and we find this report to be available to the public:

The number of vacancies in all types of property, except residential, is alarming.

Let us go to just one more city for information on this subject, and we will select Houston, Tex., and we find the report to be—

Trend of business and commercial rents steadily downward. Vacancies in office space and ground floor store space at least 15 percent.

We might take others. I think of one which I have before me. Madison, Wis.:

Vacancy in business property is the highest since 1933, and is steadily increasing.

Let us select another one from Oshkosh, Wis.:

Vacancies in the business section more than tripled in the last year.

Let us take Minneapolis, Minn.:

Vacancies on commercial and industrial space run from 8 to 40 percent. Vacancy on office-building space stands at 23 percent.

Dealing with this appalling situation may I say that I have a letter which came to my desk within the last few hours from the United States Wholesale Grocers Association, a corporation, with offices in Washington, D. C. I read the opening paragraph of that letter, in which that great organization makes this statement, which is alarming to the people of this country. I quote:

In 1 more year, or less, 50 percent of the wholesale and retail food distributors of the United States will be out of business if they must suffer a continuation of the Government's demand for reports, statements, inventories, and regulations, with which it has become physically impossible for them to comply.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am interested in the discussion the gentleman is making about the occupancy of business properties. I have looked with misgiving upon the announcement by the Secretary of War that we, as a government, are to purchase the Stevens Hotel property in Chicago. I am wondering whether it is a good rule for the Government to go out and buy properties that are in financial difficulty, rather than be a renter during the prosecution of the war, and after the war is over have such properties belong to the Government of the United States. The reported purchase price of this property was \$6,000,000.

Mr. SPRINGER. I thank my distinguished friend for that splendid observation. May I say that I am in full accord with the gentleman's view on that particular subject. I do not think it is good business for the Government to buy a property, such as the Stevens Hotel in Chicago, Ill., paying huge sums of money for it, and go into business in competition with the private investors of this Nation. When the war is over our Government will have vast holdings in real estate upon which it will undoubtedly sustain terrific losses. This money should be used for our war effort—for planes, tanks, guns, and ships.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I hope the gentleman will give us some figures on the situation in Washington, D. C., the Capital of the United States.

Mr. SPRINGER. I am happy the gentleman mentioned that matter. In the newspaper article, of which this analysis was a part, reference is made to Washington, D. C., the Nation's Capital.

The heading of that article contains this outstanding statement:

Office space almost 100 percent filled in the District of Columbia.

Of course, in Washington where money is spent in huge sums, where a tremendous number of Government employees are spending all their earnings, and where the common people—the taxpayers—have been forgotten by a spending administration, business is considered to be on a high plane as compared with the small communities throughout the Nation. There is no depressed condition in Washington. Everything is filled to capacity, including business rooms and office space.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Referring to the letter the gentleman has just read from the Wholesale Grocers' Association, stating that perhaps 50 percent of the wholesalers and retailers of the country will have to go out of business within a year, it follows, then, that we must take one of two courses, either starvation or Government distribution of food?

Mr. SPRINGER. That is entirely correct. The gentleman has analyzed the situation in splendid fashion.

Mr. CURTIS. Is Government distribution of food, or socialism, necessary to win this war, in the opinion of the gentleman?

Mr. SPRINGER. It is not. The thing that must be done in this country is to permit our farmers to produce the food which is necessary for victory in this war, but at this very moment obstructions on every hand are being placed before the farmers, which prevent them from continuing the production of the volume of food which they could produce upon their lands.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I say that if the farmer is given an opportunity and permitted to have some farm help, and if his boys, who have been engaged in farming, are not taken away from the farm, but are permitted to remain thereon and produce food, the food will be produced which will be essential for a victory in this Nation. Our farmers need farm machinery and parts, much of which he is unable to obtain at the moment. The farmers want to produce, and they can and will produce the necessary food for victory if given a chance to do so.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to my distinguished friend from Oregon.

Mr. PIERCE. I rather doubt that there is any obstruction anywhere today on the farmer producing. I just wonder

upon what grounds the gentleman makes these statements that they are still keeping the farmer from producing in quantity. It is not true in our State.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I say to the gentleman from Oregon that in my section of the country our newspapers are filled with sale advertisements, and practically all of those advertisements begin, "Because of having been inducted into the Army I am forced to hold this sale," or, "Because of my farm help being taken into the service, I am compelled to quit farming." The newspapers throughout my section of Indiana are filled with advertisements of that character.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes; I am happy to yield to my distinguished colleague from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I am sure that the gentleman from Oregon, as well as the gentleman from Indiana, has listened for some 2 or 3 weeks to the nightly broadcast of Mr. Fulton Lewis, Jr., in which he points out over the country that farming has been greatly handicapped by lack of tires and gasoline to operate the machinery on the farms.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman is entirely correct. Now may I proceed to finish my statement?

Mr. PIERCE. I challenge the statement that there is a general effort today to stop production.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. There may not be any effort to stop it, but it is being stopped.

Mr. PIERCE. There is no question but that many of our farm boys have been taken into the service, but today they are being exempted if they ask for it.

Mr. SPRINGER. And may I say to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon that in my section farmers want to produce, they are trying to produce to the limit, but they are prevented from it by reason of priorities, by reason of regulations, by reason of their farm help being taken away from them, by reason of the farm boys, who have spent their lives on the farm, being inducted into the United States Army, and by reason of that fact the farm sales are made necessary because there is no adequate help to do the work. Oregon is certainly an exception, or the gentleman is unfamiliar with conditions.

Mr. Speaker, this is a frightful situation in our country. We are at war, and the people are bending their backs to aid in the winning of the war. They want to win this war as quickly and decisively as possible. They want to aid in wiping out the very last vestige of Hitlerism, and all that it implies. They want to aid in our all-out victory in this conflict. They will make any needed sacrifice in order that victory may come to our country—but they do not approve of rules, regulations, priorities, rationing, and other destructive orders which needlessly deprive them from participating in giving that aid to our country which they desire to render in time of war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, our small businesses are suffering, and they are selling out their stocks and closing their doors. Many of these operators have passed the age in life at which they can hereafter rehabilitate themselves in business. Many of them have lost their life savings by reason of being forced out of business. This ruthless handling of the problem involved in our business world must be readjusted, and business must be restored and rehabilitated, and the life blood caused to again flow through the channels of business and trade in our country. This is highly essential now. Tomorrow will be too late to save many of them from disaster. The remedy would be simple, but it would be effective—the removal of many of the unnecessary rules and regulations which have been fastened upon them, and which now sucks the life blood from their business, would be very helpful; the removal of many of the nonessential priority rules and regulations would be stimulating, and the creation of confidence and the dispelling of fear would be the most helpful of all. Give small business a chance; stop obstructing its progress with untold and useless reports to the Government, and let our small business man go forward again in an effort to make his own way, unhampered and unfettered by governmental regimentation and domination.

Mr. Speaker, when our Government, and those in charge of the numerous agencies therein, again give business the "go sign," and stop meddling and obstructing those who form the very backbone of our Nation, we will find encouraging progress in the future. During this great emergency we cannot afford to hamper our businessmen. We must encourage them. We must grant them that God-given right to live and progress for the future.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order heretofore made, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] for 15 minutes.

CONDITIONS OF SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I shall take this time of the House to call attention to a problem that has occurred in my district, not because this one particular person is important in the affairs of the Nation, but because what is happening to him may be indicative of a widespread and broadening policy that means ruination to the backbone of our country. The little town of West Milton, in Miami County, Ohio, is located in a typical industrial and agricultural community of the Fourth Congressional District of Ohio, not unlike many of the other districts of the country, 50 percent farm population and 50 percent municipal and city population, lives a baker who has operated a bakery for some 17 years. In the early part of this month this baker wrote me a letter which I quote as follows:

Hon. ROBERT F. JONES,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I operate a bakery in West Milton, Ohio, and I have run out of sugar. The population of the town consists of almost all defense workers. This includes also the housewives. This fact makes the demand for my products very heavy, then also the bakery trucks which formerly ran routes through West Milton have discontinued their routes through this district. This fact is also very instrumental in raising the demand to even a higher standard.

Today I spent most of my afternoon and early evening in Dayton at the Office of Price Administration headquarters, trying to get an adjustment. I find that because I am in Miami County we are not entitled to extra sugar. Yet, Montgomery, Greene, Preble, and Hamilton are, because they are considered a defense area. Still we are under the rent control as a defense area.

Tomorrow I must close down my bakery until January sugar is issued. Now you know no one can keep from going broke under present conditions. I have labored here 17 years establishing my business and now to see it go out the window is more than I can take without a fight. I served 1 year in World War No. 1, and I have one son in the air service now. Another is to register in May and yet this is what is dished out to us in return.

I know Miami County is a Republican stronghold, thank God, but yet we are supposed to be united at this time of war. Truthfully I am more than willing to do anything to help in this war to bring our boys back home, but where is the justice in such rulings as put out by the Office of Price Administration?

No doubt you are a very busy man; your record has proven that. If you can be of any help in this matter, please advise and if you need more details, I will gladly furnish you with them.

Hoping for an early answer, and a favorable reply, I remain,

Very truly yours,

HARRY'S BAKERY.

WEST MILTON, OHIO.

P. S.—The people of this town are very much aroused in regard to this matter as I have the only bakery here, and it means a lot to them in packing lunches, etc. If it is within your power, investigate the ration board in Troy at your convenience. There has been very much criticism against them.

Mr. Speaker, I attempted to take the matter up with the Office of Price Control, and for several days I got the brush-off. I would get connected with the telephone line and then the line within the department would be busy. Finally, the latter part of the week, I got in touch with them. They told me that they looked up the list in their agency and they found no record in Miami County, in which this man's bakery is located, of an increase in population, although that whole county is teeming with war production. Several of the big businesses in that county have been awarded the Army and the Navy E. There is no doubt but what the population has increased. It can be proven in another agency of the Federal Government, because already additional housing has been granted by the National Housing Agency. Priorities are allowed and houses are now under construction.

In another town in Miami County the housing situation is critical, because war factories have made manpower demands,

sometimes as much as 300 percent more than a year ago. They have had to import them. In communities which are 50 percent industrial population and 50 percent country, naturally, they have to draw upon the people from the outlying smaller towns. That is what has happened in this case. In West Milton, Ohio, I am informed by this baker that nearly 80 percent of their people, both men and women, are in defense work. How does it affect the baking business of this little community when the women are working in defense plants? Naturally, they do not have time to bake; so they have to depend more and more upon this little bakery.

I talked to the Office of Price Administration, they say they will not consider it any further; they will not go into the matter; there is nothing that the man can do. He can close his doors and be damned until the 15th of December. He has been closed for almost 13 days now, because he could not get his January sugar until this date.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I am very much interested in what the gentleman is saying, because I have an identical situation in a defense county in my district, except that in this particular case the local rationing board offered some temporary help by giving them some extra sugar. This great omnipotent Office of Price Control in Washington has informed the lady that in addition to closing her business, when she does open up she has to pay back the extra sugar she has already gotten from the local board. It is outrageous.

Mr. JONES. I am very glad to have the gentleman's contribution, because anyone knows that a 17-year investment in a going concern can go down overnight when it is closed for one day. This man has been closed for 13 days. I said to the Office of Price Administration, "Can you not give him a temporary allotment?" And I was told by the O. P. A. that that would break down their entire system. I am glad to know that they did it in your case.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman misunderstood me. They did not do it. The local rationing board gave it to him and the Washington office says, "You cannot have it. You must pay it back out of your future allotment."

Mr. JONES. They did not grant my baker any additional sugar to pay back when they can review the population situation or his increased demand of 25 percent.

Mr. CURTIS. This individual is worse off than if he had not gotten a temporary order.

Mr. JONES. We passed a bill within the last few days attempting to curb the amount of questionnaires that must be answered. Here is the great Office of Price Administration that has had studies made on a score of questions. A man from one of the business organizations told me he had dug up out of his files of 5 years ago the same questionnaire that came from the Office of Price Administration lately. At that time, 5 years ago, it was to be used as a thesis

for this same gentleman, now employed in the Office of Price Administration, for his college degree. At that time business organizations did not have time to answer the questionnaires. Now they are forced to answer the whim of this employee, a former private citizen, a former student, attempting to better his own career.

The Government forces them now to answer the same questionnaires that probably have no more utility than they did 5 years ago. With all the questionnaires that are sent out, the Office of Price Administration at Washington does not know that in this same town where the bakery is closed the building-and-loan institutions' loans increased 25 percent; savings increased 30 percent; the post office shows money-order increases, 50 percent; postage and stamps, 27 percent; an increase in rural route boxes of 25 percent; gas connections, 20 percent. This man's bakery business has increased 25 percent. He has given me a log of what his business requirements were from January 1941 to December. He says, seriously enough, in his comment about reporting this schedule of sugar:

The only mistake I made was the fact that I told the truth.

I have a clipping from the November 20 issue of the Washington Times-Herald:

The small business outlook is grim, War Production Board declares.

Yes; it may be grim. Large contracts are handed out to the larger companies, and the O. P. A. runs the little ones out of business with rationing regulations. They draft questionnaires and cavort around the country to aid in their research, but they have a paralysis of analysis of the disaster they are spreading. To back up this statement that they have a paralysis of analysis, I have several letters from the Office of Price Administration with reference to gasoline rationing. Businessmen, who have salesmen on the road to deal with farmers, to help them raise food for freedom—food for victory—asked how much gas would be allowed for their salesmen to call upon the farmers. On December 3, 1942, the O. P. A. said:

We still have this problem under consideration.

Land of goshen! How long do they have to have a problem under consideration to find a formula? The gasoline-rationing problem in our section of the country is the same as it is in the East for we have about the same percentage of rural and city populations; just about the same problems come up; yet after 6 months they are still studying the problem. O. P. A.'s gasoline division are taking off these rural bakery routes and the sugar bureaucrats have now made it impossible for this baker to serve not only his former customers but the 25 percent increase that has been thrown upon him.

Some morning we shall wake up to find the entire rank and file of small business men in this country out of business and this source of revenue dried up if we permit the O. P. A. to continue its present policy of studying questionnaires, and coming to no conclusions. I sincerely hope something can be done

to save the backbone of our country, the small business man.

It may be we have passed through the era of experiment, through the heyday of the New Deal when we were going to save the little man. Do you remember how it was published in the newspapers that a humble colored man in the South, a sharecropper, was able to get the President of the United States on the phone to save his home? This problem is just as serious to the baker in my district as the sharecropper's problem was to him, yet I hesitate to bother the President of the United States, beset by manifold problems of winning the war as Commander in Chief. I think we have reached and are now passing through an era of new dealism that is really fanaticism on the part of these bureaucrats who are trying to make America over. It is nothing short of fanaticism; it is really a religion. They seem to feel that the Good Samaritan approach to the relief of trouble is too old-fashioned.

You remember the story, how the priest and the Levite passed up the man who lay wounded and beaten on the highway. The Good Samaritan came along, bound up his wounds, put him on his mule, took him to the inn, and provided for him until the Good Samaritan could come back and care for him. The new dealers seeing the wounded man on the highway declare an emergency, decide a spending project is the only thing that can help the dying man, investigate the feasibility, call in specialists, but instead of binding up the poor unfortunate one's wounds, they build a new stretch of highway under him.

If we as a Congress are going to neglect the cries of the little business men, of which this instance is one small example among many, many thousands of private enterprise shall fail entirely. I feel that the next Congress will not let these abuses go unheeded. The people will not stand for it.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

WE SHOULD ESTABLISH A NATIONAL COMMISSION FOR POST-WAR RECONSTRUCTION

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have this opportunity to express my hearty support of House Joint Resolution 291, to establish the National Commission for Post-War Reconstruction. I deeply regret that it is not being adopted before the adjournment of this Congress. It was my privilege to appear before the subcommittee of the Committee on Labor, when hearings were held on the original resolution introduced by the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] and state some of the reasons why I favored its adoption.

I consider it to be of the utmost importance that studies should be made and plans formulated now to deal with the problems which we know we are going to have to face when this war ends. Congress owes a duty to the American people to legislatively provide the legal machinery for this purpose. Our

post-war social problems are going to be tremendous and we should be studying the means and methods to meet them and solve them properly.

Our first duty, of course, is to the brave men and women who will return to civilian life when peace comes. They are entitled to immediate and remunerative employment and to enjoy the social benefits for which they have fought and sacrificed and risked their lives. If we as a Nation and Government fail in that duty, we will meet and doubtless be subjected to a national chastisement more humiliating and severe in its consequences than could have ever been inflicted by a foreign conqueror.

The maladjustments of family and community life, the dislocations to small business, the conversion of industry, all present problems which will be difficult but possible of solution if they receive sufficient study, consideration and planning while we still have the time to do so.

The resolution of the gentleman from California [Mr. Voorhis] should have been adopted months ago and a national commission should now be holding hearings, taking testimony, and studying every phase of our post-war problems and formulating plans for the necessary course of action and procedure.

We have made many fine and noble promises to our own people and to the world in regard to the just social and economic order which we have pledged ourselves to inaugurate. We are not only committed, as I have indicated, to dealing resolutely and effectively with the post-war problems arising directly out of the present conflict but also we stand committed to doing something about the social and economic problems which vexed and plagued us before the outbreak of the war, which, indeed, contributed essentially to bringing on the war. We should also be studying these problems, such as the production and distribution of wealth, doing away with poverty, education and abolishing ignorance, monetary reform, and the underlying causes of social injustice and economic insecurity, the causes of war.

Are we going to let the Nation drift again after the war ends, or are we going to have the intelligence, moral courage, patriotism, vision, and Christian statesmanship to do something about these matters? If there ever was a time in our history and the history of the world when such a national commission, as is contemplated by the pending joint resolution, should be functioning, that time is now.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert as part of my remarks the statement which I made before the subcommittee of the Committee on Labor on June 30, 1941.

The statement is as follows:

ESTABLISHING THE POST-EMERGENCY ECONOMIC
ADVISORY COMMISSION AND A NATIONAL
UNEMPLOYMENT COMMISSION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE
COMMITTEE ON LABOR,

Washington, D. C., June 30, 1941.

The committee met at 10 a. m., Hon. ROBERT RAMSPECK (chairman) presiding.

Mr. RAMSPECK. The committee will be in order. We will hear first our colleague from the State of Washington, Mr. SMITH.

STATEMENT OF HON. MARTIN F. SMITH, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I deeply appreciate this opportunity to appear before the committee. I desire to commend our colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. Voorhis] for presenting House Joint Resolution 76 to the House. I also desire to commend the Committee on Labor, and particularly this subcommittee, for conducting hearings on that resolution, which I think is of great importance and presents to Congress a subject which is certainly vital and ought to be acted on favorably. I have no prepared statement and will discuss this matter very informally.

For many years, even prior to the time I was elected to Congress, I have been interested in the subject of economics, and since I was elected to Congress, in 1932, I have tried to study that subject to as great an extent as time and my official duties permitted. I think I have read about every important book that has been written on the subject, and I have tried to read as many of the reports of committees of Congress bearing on the subject as time has permitted.

I think we all must be agreed that there is something radically wrong with our economic and social system. We find that it is the opinion of leading chemists, engineers, scientists, and inventors that we have in our country all the necessary raw materials; we have the skilled labor; we have the industrial plant; we have the transportation and communication systems; and we have everything that is necessary to provide all the people of our country with the basic necessities of life—food, clothing, and shelter; and yet in the midst of all this abundance and this plethora of everything that is required to make people comfortable and happy we find a condition of poverty, destitution, unemployment, and human misery which is absolutely appalling.

Our administration, of which I am happy and proud to be a part, has had to face this problem now for 9 years. Of course, it became acute several years before we came into power, and yet, much to our regret and chagrin and disappointment, I think we have not made any fundamental approach to the solution of these problems at all.

Here we find ourselves at the end of 9 years still having to conduct a Work Projects Administration program or a relief program.

I just want to cite a few statistics from reports of the Social Security Board on wages. For instance, in 1937, which was the highest wage year between 1929 and 1939, of the 30,000,000 wage earners in industry, commerce, and transportation, more than one-third had annual incomes of less than \$500; about 8,500,000 of these workers had an annual income of less than \$300. More than 14,500,000 had an income, an annual income, of less than \$700. Close to 19,000,000, or two-thirds of the workers, had annual wage earnings of less than \$1,000. These figures do not include domestic workers or agricultural workers, who are among the lowest paid in the country.

This means that two-thirds of our wage earners receive less than \$1,300, set as an absolute minimum by our Government for a family of four, a father, a mother, a boy of 13, and a girl of 8. The Heller Committee for Research in Social Economics, at the University of California, has set \$2,200 as a minimum for health and decency for a family of five. Ninety percent of our wage earners fall below this level.

Consequently, it must be obvious to us that there is something wrong with the distribution of earnings and wealth in this country when it can so truthfully be said that we have a few men with millions of dollars and millions of men without a dollar, and who apparently cannot find any opportunity to make a dollar.

It has never been my opinion that the Government owes anybody a living, but certainly the Government owes everybody an opportunity to make an honest living. Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, which are the keystone in the temple of our Government, become a hollow mockery when so many millions—in fact, the great majority of the masses of the people of this country—apparently cannot even make a decent living and secure the fruits of their labor, which they are ready, able, and willing to perform.

Certainly, therefore, I agree that a committee of Congress should be appointed and empowered under the resolution introduced by the gentleman from California and by Senator WAGNER in the Senate, to conduct a thorough-going study and investigation of all these conditions which bear upon the economic life of the people of this country, and which will confront us whenever the present war ceases.

I hope in that connection that the committee, when it is appointed, will also study our banking and monetary system. We are agreed, and every fact indicates it, that we could produce easily not only what is necessary, but a surplus of the necessities of life—there could be a surplus provided. In fact, it is estimated by leading chemists, engineers, and economists of highest repute that we in the United States could by availing ourselves of the benefits of agricultural chemistry, feed the world. We could become the bread basket for the world, and we could spread a table for the entire human race so that they could have all the food that they require, from this country alone.

In fact, it has been estimated that in the State of Texas alone we could raise enough food to feed the entire United States of America. Yet we have right in the midst of that condition all this appalling unemployment and poverty and destitution and human misery.

It is a serious reflection upon every person who is connected with the Government, and certainly upon every Member of Congress, because we owe a duty which we must discharge to the people of this country. Therefore, I say there must also be something wrong with our banking and monetary system, because apparently we do not have a system under which we can distribute these foodstuffs and the goods which we can manufacture to the people of the country who are in need of them.

I view a monetary system as being merely a transportation system. You can also compare it with the use of the postage stamp. The purpose is delivery, to transport these articles, these products, to those in need of them. There, it seems to me, is where our monetary and banking system has broken down. We are agreed we can produce all these goods, and a surplus, and yet we do not seem to be able to get them into the hands of the people who are in desperate need of them. That largely must be the fault of the monetary and banking system. We are not succeeding in distributing what we are capable of producing.

It was my privilege on the 21st of May to take part in a seminar on the present relations between money and income which was held in New York City. The chairman was Senator JOSEPH O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming. I appeared as a member from the House. Other members of the panel were Mr. Stuart Chase, economist and writer; Dr. Noel Sargent, secretary of the National Association of Manufacturers; Dr. Murray Shields, economist for the Irving Trust Co.; Dr. Bradford Smith, economist for the United States Steel Corporation; and Prof. Ray Westerfield, of Yale University. We had a seminar which was supposed to last about an hour. We met at 2:30 and were supposed to conclude at 3:30. But we continued—we were so interested and absorbed—we continued until after 5 o'clock. We asked and answered questions regarding

the present relations between money and income, and that is one of the phases of our problem which I had in mind when I referred to our banking and monetary system.

I think that is one subject that we need to go to the bottom of, and it certainly would be a proper province of such a committee as the one contemplated by the resolution of the gentleman from California.

Then, in conclusion, may I suggest that it seems to me we are suffering also from a moral depression, a spiritual depression. I think the committee should give some study to that.

Dr. Frank N. D. Buchman, the founder of the moral rearmament movement, has said that we have enough for everybody's need but not enough for everybody's greed. I think it would be well for the committee to give some thought to the moral rearmament program. They have just issued a booklet, *You Can Defend America*. I want to commend it to the members of this committee, as I have to every other Member of the House and of the Senate.

We are certainly suffering from a spiritual depression in this country. Those few who have succeeded in getting control of the finances and the wealth of this country apparently fall in their obligation and in their duty to the masses of the people and are determined to get all of the profit that they possibly can exact from the people of the Nation. They need to get a different viewpoint, it seems to me.

The time is coming in our country when we are going to have to consider more the p-r-o-p-h-e-t-s instead of the p-r-o-f-i-t-s. That time is probably not far distant.

When you come to consider what we can do in this country to give employment, the Brookings Institution has estimated that the capital that could be required to make good the impairment of the heavy industries—that is, improvements that could be made and should be made in the industrial structure of the country—would be tremendous. We realize now, according to the estimates, that 40 percent of the employable people in this country, with the present machinery and plant that we have, could produce everything that is required, showing what a surplus of labor you are going to have and their scheme of further shortening the workday and workweek and retiring citizens past middle life. However, if we modernize, bring our machinery and industrial plant down to date, and take advantage of the discoveries and improvements that have been made available by engineers, inventors, and scientists in the past decade, then you could probably get along with about 25 percent of the available skilled labor in the country. It would cost between \$22,000,000,000 and \$26,000,000,000, according to the Brookings Institution, to bring that industrial plant down to date, the expenditure of which would involve a great deal of employment and use of materials of all kinds.

It seems to me we are on the threshold of Utopia if we avail ourselves of all the progress that has been made instead of continuing to deprive our people, the masses of our people, of these advantages and improvements through a short-sighted policy of pure selfishness and ignorance. It must be both. It must be selfishness and it must be ignorance. That reminds me of a little story—and, if I may, I shall conclude by telling this story, Mr. Chairman—of the experience of our colleague from Oklahoma, WILBURN CARTWRIGHT. The story has not been generally told, and perhaps some of you may not have heard it. A constituent of his came to Washington from one of his rural counties a few summers ago and spent about a week in the Capital. Of course, he had a great time and saw a great many interesting places. When he got home to Oklahoma, his friends asked him how he enjoyed his time here in Washing-

ton. Well, it was in the month of August, and during that time we all know about the humidity. The humidity here is very bad at that time. He had heard a good deal about it. Now, it happened that the old gentleman was a little deaf and so when they asked him how he enjoyed his trip to Washington he replied that he had had a fine time; he had seen a great many historic places, very inspiring and very interesting places; "but," he said, "the stupidity was awful." [Laughter.]

Now, I do not want to be quite as harsh as that; but I do think it is about time that we got down to the bottom of our problems and tried to find out what was wrong with our country and with our economic and social system and consider fundamentals instead of expedients and temporary palliatives.

I want to congratulate you, Mr. Chairman and members of this committee, because you have the courage and the foresight and are willing to sacrifice the time to undertake that important duty. I think it is very important, and I know you are going to have the cooperation and support of every Member of Congress.

Thank you very much.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Thank you, Mr. SMITH. Are there any questions?

Mr. LANDIS. I would like to know which of these resolutions you favor, 59 or 76? Do you have any preference?

Mr. SMITH. I have no particular preference. I thought they were almost identical. Of course I favor the one Mr. VOORHIS originally introduced. I think that is House Joint Resolution 59.

Mr. DAY. You mentioned House Joint Resolution 76 in the first part of your statement.

Mr. SMITH. As I stated at the outset, I am speaking extemporaneously and have no prepared statement. I may have inadvertently misspoken there. I should have referred to House Joint Resolution 59.

Mr. VOORHIS. The only difference is in the make-up of the commission, Mr. Smith.

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. KELLEY. I think what the gentleman had in mind was with reference to the size of the proposed commission. That is what we are interested in; that is, whether it should be a large or a small commission and what representation they should have on it. That is the thing we are trying to determine. The make-up of the commission is a very essential matter to decide, because on it may depend the efficiency of the work that may be accomplished. If it is too large it may be cumbersome.

Mr. SMITH. I would think that a rather small, compact commission would do a better job.

Mr. DAY. You appreciate that the element of credulity becomes important. What I mean is that the people feel that the Old Deal did not make good and the New Deal has not fulfilled so much of the promise, so that the element of credulity becomes a part in connection with this new plan.

Mr. SMITH. Yes. I do not think anybody has any one plan, because this whole matter has too many phases and ramifications to it. It is going to require, it seems to me, a thorough study and probing of our entire social and economic system, more or less. We are going to have to consider doing things which we have never done before. You are going to have the problem of trying to get the purchasing power into the hands of the people. We have the farm problem, which we have not solved. Then you have the matter of idle capital in this country. We are suffering not only from idle labor but from idle capital. You have to consider the investment field in that connection and what is wrong with it.

Finally, as I mentioned before, you have the banking and monetary system, which seems to have broken down completely, and is not performing the functions for which it

was originally designed at all, the movement of goods and services.

Whichever commission is appointed, they will have the biggest task to perform, it seems to me, that has ever faced any group of men in the history of the Congress, in order to do a thorough job. They ought to call before them, when they have their hearings, every person in the country who is an authority on any of these subjects, and particularly engineers, chemists, scientists, inventors, students of money and finance, as well as leaders of labor, agriculture, religion, and industry.

If the engineers, chemists, scientists, and inventors were consulted freely they could provide a superabundance, if they were permitted to do it, of the basic necessities of life—food, clothing, and shelter—for every man, woman, and child in America.

A group of scientists said not long ago that the countries of the world for instance—if you want to go outside of our own boundaries—could sustain in comfort and even luxury a population six times the present population of the earth. Yet, due to our blindness, we have wars raging in Europe because nations are fighting for what they call living room and because they cannot agree on the division of the natural resources and raw materials and are slaughtering the human race when there is no justification or excuse for it whatever.

If we could have cooperation among the nations, just as much as we need cooperation within our own country, these problems could be solved. Sometimes I wonder if Bernard Shaw was not right when he said that undoubtedly this planet was the insane asylum of the solar system.

Mr. CONNERY. In view of what you have said, that our whole economic system will have to be reconstructed following this present emergency—and I think we all agree on that—I was wondering why you would favor a small commission which might bring about a representation only of the so-called technocrats, and on which you would not get the representation of the various voices that should be heard throughout the country, such as industry and labor. I am referring to direct representation. Take labor, for instance. Of course, that is what I am wholeheartedly interested in.

Mr. SMITH. So am I.

Mr. CONNERY. Labor means the people.

Mr. SMITH. Absolutely, for they are the majority.

Mr. CONNERY. And if anybody should have a voice, they should have a voice on this commission.

Mr. SMITH. Yes; I mentioned that group first.

Mr. CONNERY. Of course, in the commission's dealings they will have to get the other side of the story, and there should be a direct representation from industry. Then it has been proposed here, and I think you will agree, that religion should be heard on this proposition.

Mr. SMITH. Yes; our religious leaders should analyze the economics of the Bible, which are practical but have not been applied as yet.

Mr. CONNERY. There has been too little religion.

Mr. SMITH. There has been entirely too little, and that is the main cause of all our troubles. We have been disregarding and violating the basic laws of the universe which are spiritual and moral.

Mr. CONNERY. Do you not think, in view of that, that a larger commission might be advisable in order that these voices might all be heard in direct representation rather than just being brought in to give testimony, and then made to step aside?

Mr. SMITH. It just occurs to me that it might be possible to have an advisory committee of a larger number representing every segment of our population.

Mr. LANDIS. Most of our witnesses have objected to that.

Mr. SMITH. Then to have a smaller working commission that would actually conduct the hearings, and would do most of the real work—the laborious work that would have to be done—the results of which, or the findings of which, could be submitted to this more numerous group for further study, analysis, and final conclusions and recommendations.

It has been my observation here in Congress and all through my life that if you want a job well done, you have got to centralize the responsibility and the performance of the task itself. If you have too many working at it, usually you do not get as good results. Is not that generally true?

Mr. CONNERY. I think that is true. But I feel that these voices that we have mentioned because they represent a majority of the people, should have direct representation on this commission.

Mr. SMITH. Yes. You should have labor, I would say, first of all; and you should have agriculture.

Mr. CONNERY. That is true.

Mr. SMITH. You should have industry and you should have science, religion, and finance.

Mr. CONNERY. Of course, if you have three Members from the House and three Members from the Senate, and six other members representing public groups, you are going to be in a difficult position to try to get representation for all of these various groups who should be heard, within the six remaining after you have appointed the three from the House and the three from the Senate.

Mr. SMITH. Your field is so vast, the field that you are going to have to consider, that it might be that a commission of 21 or 25 members might be necessary and advisable. Of course, if you did have that many, you could divide it up into subcommittees. That could be easily done, and it might be advisable for each subcommittee to consider certain specific problems, such as Mr. VOORHIS' unemployment conference of the House of Representatives, of which I have had the honor to be an active member in the last Congress and in this Congress. We have had the work subdivided and have considered 8 or 9 vital subjects by separate groups. Then afterward the smaller group reports to the full conference. Some such arrangement and division as that might be practicable.

Mr. CONNERY. That is the big question that we have here.

Mr. SMITH. I realize that is a question to which the committee will have to give a great deal of consideration.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Thank you, Mr. Smith.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert as part of my remarks a statement which I made before a subcommittee of the Committee on Labor on June 30, 1941.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNES] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HARNES. Mr. Speaker, I have been intensely interested in the discussions of my two distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from Indiana and the gentleman from Ohio, concerning the tragic situation facing the small businessman and small industry in this country. At intervals during the past 18 months I have urged this Congress to do something to alleviate this distressing situation. We, of course, recognize the fact that some of the things that have happened to small business and industry

are the inevitable result of war, but most of the things that have happened to destroy small business and industry are due to the bungling bureaucracy this Congress has permitted to exist in Washington during the past several years.

During the past months I have received hundreds of communications from business men and women in my district and State, but today I want to call this particular letter to your attention.

The letter is dated December 8, 1942, and reads as follows:

ANDERSON, IND., December 8, 1942.

DEAR Mr. HARNES: I just can't keep silent any longer. I am trying so hard to be 100 percent behind the war effort. I have one son in the service and another who will come under the 18-year-old draft. For that reason and countless others, we pray for speedy victory. In everything that we as a family do we are conscious that we are in war and have governed ourselves accordingly.

But here is the "hurt." Our auto agency, our only means of income for our family of six, was padlocked last January 1st. My husband being an aggressive person, immediately took stock of what remained of our little business to determine how he could make ends meet with big overhead expense, last year's taxes, a family to feed and educate, a home to finish paying for, etc., etc. The shop and small farm must then furnish our means of support.

For almost a year now the shop has been operating under great handicaps due to the fact that Delco-Remy and Guide Lamp factories are paying wages we cannot compete with. Some of the mechanics have preferred to remain with us, but the Selective Service has frightened them into going to the factory by threats. The above-mentioned factories have even come into the shop in person and hired the men. Therefore, a shortage of skilled auto mechanics has reduced the operation of the shop. I thought in a large industrial city your genuine auto repair shops were considered a vital and essential business. We are forced to turn the customers away daily because of shortage of help. Foreseeing he must do something further, my husband opened a semimachine shop. It took weeks of preparation, a lot of waiting for priority numbers to purchase machines and materials. He started with one "ace" operator and himself, this shop was opened in our former salesroom, and he was beginning to see the way, all parts made were accepted and orders for more are on file. Then the last straw came yesterday, Mr. HARNES, which prompts me to write you. The United States Employment Agency which came under Mr. McNutt December 7, forced this operator to leave my husband's machine shop to go to one of three factories here. He tried to explain to the board that what he was doing was as vital to defense as anything he could do in the factory. But the Board replied, "You go where we tell you or else we will put you where you won't want to go, and as for these little one-man businesses, they will all soon be out of business." For your information, the very employees that the factories have "drafted" from our repair shop have come back time and again and related how they stand around and do nothing all day. One man told me himself that our little 8-year-old could do all he had to do. Another said he didn't know what they called him for, he did nothing all evening but smoke and chat with others. Surely, Mr. HARNES, this isn't the way Mr. McNutt intends to distribute labor? Is the one-man business doomed? Will he lose all his investment in a modern, up-to-date auto agency and now his investment in machines and materials for which he has Government orders and can't operate? We are trying to squeeze a small profit out of a small farm on which he has

stock. But the rationing board has cut his allowance for gasoline in half.

He is now too discouraged to fight or care. All our years of work to establish some security seems to have been in vain.

Would you show my letter to Hon. McNutt. I am sure there are others who are under the dictatorship of such local agencies and I can't believe it is his policy.

Thanking you,

Mrs. D. J. MUNSON,
Rural Route 2, Anderson, Ind.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HARNES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNES]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARNES. Mr. Speaker, this is just typical of the disasters that have overtaken and are overtaking thousands of small businessmen throughout the Nation. It is next in tragedy to this war and unless the next Congress does something to alleviate the suffering of these people, it indeed will be a national tragedy and a national disgrace.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNES. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Have we not enacted a small-business law and have we not appropriated some money to help the very conditions that the gentleman is speaking about? And may I say I am in full sympathy with the gentleman's views?

Mr. HARNES. Yes, but what can they do as long as you have a bureaucracy down here that is handling the manpower situation as they have so far handled it?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. How would the gentleman correct these conditions?

Mr. HARNES. By stopping these threats to employees, and by driving this administration to correct the inequities which are destroying small business. Also by exercising the constitutional authority entrusted to Congress to protect the American system of free enterprise from this increasingly dictatorial bureaucracy.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I think the gentleman should follow through with that.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNES. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Did you ever see any force imposed upon any one greater than that imposed upon Montgomery Ward & Co., demanding that they take on all the orders of the National Labor Relations Board?

Mr. HARNES. Of course, the entire Nation is amazed at such dictatorial, bureaucratic action on the part of this Government.

Mr. RICH. It is a shame and a disgrace to American liberty and American independence.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNES. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that

the gentleman may proceed for 1 additional minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. May I ask the gentleman this question: Is it not true that this is the first time when the President personally has indulged in the bureaucratic action to which the gentleman just referred in such scathing terms?

Mr. HARNESS. Of course, it is the first time I have ever seen or heard of such a thing happening. I shall comply with the request of this correspondent and send her letter to Mr. McNutt, and I believe the House will be interested in learning what action the War Manpower Commissioner will take to effect a solution to these problems.

[Here the gavel fell.]

ADJOURNMENT SINE DIE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I call up Senate Concurrent Resolution 41.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the two Houses of Congress shall adjourn on Wednesday, the 16th of December 1942, and that when they adjourn on said day, they stand adjourned sine die.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RETURN OF H. R. 5444 TO SENATE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following request from the Senate, which was read:

Ordered, That the Secretary be directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (H. R. 5444) to amend the act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, together with the Senate engrossed amendment thereto.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request will be complied with.

There was no objection.

SIGNING OF ENROLLED BILLS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 42), which was read:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That, notwithstanding the adjournment of the second session of the Seventy-seventh Congress, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives be, and they are hereby, authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses which have been examined by the Committee on Enrolled Bills of each House and found truly enrolled.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. CARLSON asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.)

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address delivered by Harold Parsons at the celebration of the three hundredth anniversary of the city of Gloucester.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of tomorrow's RECORD and to include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Gatling, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6386. An act to provide for an adjustment of salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, to conform with the increased cost of living in the District of Columbia, and also to conform with wages paid in many cities of the Nation.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 6730. An act to protect the public health by the prevention of certain practices leading to dental disorders; and to prevent the circumvention of certain State or Territorial laws regulating the practice of dentistry; and

H. J. Res. 359. Joint resolution to amend Public Law 623, Seventy-seventh Congress, entitled "Joint resolution to codify and emphasize existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America".

COMPENSATION OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 170, extending until April 30, 1943, the period for which overtime rates of compensation may be paid under the acts of June 28, 1940 (54 Stat. 676), October 21, 1940 (54 Stat. 1205), and June 3, 1941 (55 Stat. 241), and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Be it resolved, etc., That the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution extending the period for which overtime rates of compensation may be paid under certain acts," approved July 3, 1942, is amended by striking out "November 30, 1942," and inserting "April 30, 1943": Provided, That the authorization contained herein to pay overtime compensation to certain groups of employees is hereby extended, effective December 1, 1942, to all civilian employees in or under the United States Government, including Government-owned or controlled organizations (except employees in the legislative and judicial branches), and to those employees of the District of Columbia municipal government who occupy positions subject to the

Classification Act of 1923, as amended: Provided further, That such extension shall not apply to (a) those whose wages are fixed on a daily or hourly basis and adjusted from time to time in accordance with prevailing rates by wage boards or similar administrative authority serving the same purpose, (b) elected officials, (c) heads of departments, independent establishments and agencies, and (d) employees outside the continental limits of the United States, including Alaska, who are paid in accordance with local prevailing native wage rates for the area in which employed: Provided further, That overtime compensation authorized herein and under the Act approved February 10, 1942 (Public Law No. 450, 77th Cong.) and section 4 of the act approved May 2, 1941 (Public Law No. 46, 77th Cong.), as amended, shall be payable only on that part of an employee's basic compensation not in excess of \$2,900 per annum, and each such employee shall be paid only such overtime compensation or portion thereof as will not cause his aggregate compensation to exceed a rate of \$5,000 per annum: And provided further, That officers or employees whose compensation is based on mileage, postal receipts, fees, piecework, or other than a time-period basis or whose hours of duty are intermittent, irregular, or less than full time, substitute employees whose compensation is based upon a rate per hour or per day, and employees in or under the legislative and judicial branches, shall be paid additional compensation, in lieu of the overtime compensation authorized herein, amounting to 10 percent of so much of their earned basic compensation as is not in excess of a rate of \$2,900 per annum, and each such employee shall be paid only such additional compensation or portion thereof as will not cause his aggregate compensation to exceed a rate of \$5,000 per annum.

Sec. 2. Within 30 days after the enactment of this act the heads of departments and agencies in the executive branch whose employees are affected by the provisions of this joint resolution, shall present to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget such information as he shall require for the purpose of justifying the number of employees in their respective departments or agencies. If any such department or agency fails to present such information or if, in the opinion of the Director, the information so presented fails to disclose that the number of such employees in any department or agency is necessary to the proper and efficient exercise of its functions, the personnel of such department or agency shall be reduced, upon the order of the Director, by such number as the Director finds to be in excess of the minimum requirements of such department or agency. Upon the expiration of 30 days from the date of issuance of such order by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget the provisions of the first section of this joint resolution shall cease to be applicable to the employees of the agency affected by such order, unless and until the head thereof has certified to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget that such order has been complied with. The Civil Service Commission is authorized to transfer to other departments or agencies any employees released pursuant to this section, whose services are needed in and can be effectively utilized by such other departments or agencies.

Sec. 3. The provisions of the Saturday half holiday law of March 3, 1931 (46 Stat. 1482; U. S. C. title 5, sec. 26 (a)), are hereby suspended for the period during which this joint resolution is in effect.

Sec. 4. This joint resolution shall take effect as of December 1, 1942, and shall terminate on April 30, 1943, or such earlier date as the Congress by concurrent resolution may prescribe.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, the House probably remembers that on two occasions we have by joint resolution extended the overtime pay for about 52 percent of the employees of the Government. The last extension expired on November 30, and we have been making an effort to work out the situation.

The present Senate joint resolution extends the overtime provisions which were in effect up to November 30. In addition, it extends the same privilege to other employees in the Government service who work on an hourly or weekly basis, putting them on the same basis as those who were under the resolution which expired on November 30. It pays, not time and a half but about time and a quarter. This is based on a computation of 306 days instead of 280, as it would be if you would base it on a straight 40-hour week. This means that those who would work 48 hours would get 21 percent, as I recall, in overtime pay; and if they would work 4 hours overtime, they would get about 10½ percent.

In addition, the bill provides for a 10-percent increase in pay for employees who do not work on an hourly basis, including the employees of the legislative and judicial branches of the Government. It includes all employees in the Capitol here. However, a limitation is involved both as to overtime and the 10 percent. It is payable only on the first \$2,900 of a person's pay. If a person gets \$3,000 a year, he gets the increase on \$2,900. Those who make more than \$5,000 do not get any increase or any overtime.

Briefly, that explains what this joint resolution does. It is limited to expire on April 30, 1943. It is hoped that the new Congress in the first 3 months of its life will work out this problem on a satisfactory basis.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I am interested in section 2 of this bill, and I shall read a portion of it to the House:

SEC. 2. Within 30 days after the enactment of this act the heads of departments and agencies in the executive branch whose employees are affected by the provisions of this joint resolution, shall present to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget such information as he shall require for the purpose of justifying the number of employees in their respective departments or agencies. If any such department or agency fails to present such information or if, in the opinion of the Director, the information so presented fails to disclose that the number of such employees in any department or agency is necessary to the prompt and efficient exercise of its functions, the personnel of such department or agency shall be reduced, upon the order of the Director, by such number as the Director finds to be in excess of the minimum requirements of such department or agency.

Then further on in this section we read:

The Civil Service Commission is authorized to transfer to other departments or agencies any employees released pursuant to this section, whose services are needed in and can be effectively utilized by such other departments or agencies.

I wish to ask whether the end to be sought here is to stop or slow down the employing of new personnel and try to make use of the excess employees for new positions that may be called for in the future? Is that the intention of this provision?

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is my understanding of it, and I may say to the gentleman from Ohio that I share what I think is his view, that we ought to take whatever method is possible to hold down the number of employees, and reduce that number in any case where it can be shown there is an excess. I think the purpose of the last sentence which the gentleman read is to give somebody authority, to transfer surplus employees, if there is found to be a surplus, to an agency that may be expanding. Of course, we will have some agencies in the future that may expand, necessarily so, but I think unquestionably that there has been some overstaffing in the hurry to expand these agencies for war purposes, and this is a good way, I think, to put a check on them, and give the Director of the Budget some authority and the Civil Service Commission some authority, to put that check on.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The language of this section would indicate a clear recognition of the all-too-evident fact that there is overstaffing of Government personnel and that something should be done about it. Maybe this does not mean much but it at least indicates a sign pointing in the right direction and we ought to be glad even for that.

The whole country is aware of the enormous redundancy of persons on the Federal pay roll. I believe there are a million more persons on the Federal pay roll now than are necessary. I am convinced if that number were eliminated no harm would be done to the Federal services, but on the contrary they would be greatly improved.

It is my sincere hope that the next Congress will not hesitate to take drastic steps to bring about a substantial reduction in the number of persons now employed in the executive branch of the Government.

I am sure a great many Members would feel better in supporting this measure if we had more assurance that the greatly overstaffed agencies of the Federal Government would be reduced to a size consistent with real requirements.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I shall certainly cooperate with the gentleman in any way I can to remove from the pay roll any unneeded employees.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes more.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Let me ask the gentleman from Georgia about this matter. Nearly 60 days ago, or a little more than 60 days ago, the gentleman said that if we extended at that time the bill for 60 days

they would have a new bill in the House so that we would not inconvenience these employees. Why did we not have the bill brought in so that we could act on it in better manner than by unanimous consent today?

Mr. RAMSPECK. The only answer that I can give the gentleman is this. Another bill was worked out, and we expected it would come up in the other body about a month ago, but then the steering committee over there decided they would not let it come up. Another bill was worked out and reported and for some reason the Senate Civil Service Committee abandoned that and took this up. That is the only answer that I can give the gentleman.

Mr. RICH. If we extend this to April 30, 1943, is it reasonable to suppose that the committees, both in the House and in the Senate, will take action on this bill and get legislation that will be more permanent, so that the Government employees will know what is going to happen and the people of the country will know what is going to happen so far as the wages of these employees are concerned?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I think I can assure the gentleman, as far as the House committee is concerned, that we will make earnest effort to work out a reasonable solution of the matter between now and April 30, 1943.

Mr. RICH. There is one thing that I want to be sure of before we let the bill go through and that is that all Government employees who are now receiving time and a half or double time for any of their services are not going to benefit on that part of their labors on which they get time-and-a-half time and double time. Is this 10 percent going to be applied to those employees who are receiving time and a half or double time? If it is, we cannot let this go through, because that would not be right.

Mr. RAMSPECK. No; the 10 percent applies only to those people who do not benefit from the overtime.

Mr. RICH. I am very glad to hear that because I understood that was to be applicable to certain branches of the Government and not to others. It would not be fair, and we could not permit it to go through.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Frankly one of the things that has delayed this legislation is that there has been an effort upon the part of some employees of the Government to get both overtime and the 10 percent. That is not in the bill. They will get their overtime or the 10 percent.

Mr. RICH. Then I want to congratulate whatever Senator it was over there in the other body who brought that about, because whoever it was did the country a real service. Fifty-two percent of the Government employees are benefited here. Why could they not have made the benefit applicable to all Government employees?

Mr. RAMSPECK. This bill does make it applicable to all of them. It treats them all alike. All those who work on an hourly basis are put under the overtime provision until the 30th of April next and those who do not work on a weekly schedule are given the 10 percent.

Mr. RICH. One other statement I desire to make. No manufacturer in this country, no storekeeper or farmer or businessman can raise the wages of his employees without following out the Executive order made by the President setting up Jimmie Byrnes as a dictator of wages. Nobody can raise wages 1 penny without getting permission from Jimmie Byrnes.

This Congress gave that permission to the President and he in turn gave it to Judge Byrnes. Why is it that the Congress will not permit anybody else in the country to do that, yet you come in here with a bill and do the very thing that you refuse to permit the people of this country to do? Where is there any justice in that?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I think the justice for it is this, that these employees have had no pay raises, in most cases, since 1923 or 1925. Private employees, who are now being regulated by the act of Congress, have in most cases, at least, had pay increases within recent years.

Mr. RICH. Suppose there are those who did not receive pay increases?

Mr. KOPPELMANN. If the gentleman will yield, they are permitted to pay up to 15 percent over January 1, 1941—increase their pay.

Mr. RAMSPECK. As a matter of fact, in the law which we passed, to which the gentleman from Pennsylvania refers, and the power of which has been delegated more or less to Mr. Byrnes, it does permit increases, but only subject to the War Labor Board.

Mr. RICH. Yes; they have to approve it.

Mr. RAMSPECK. In other words, we did not put an absolute ceiling on wages.

Mr. RICH. Will Mr. Byrnes have to review this legislation and pass on it?

Mr. RAMSPECK. No, sir; he does not.

Mr. RICH. This is taking it out of his hands? In other words, this is the law when it passes the House?

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is my understanding. He has nothing to do with this.

Mr. RICH. Then if a Government employee who does not do greater piece work than someone in an industrial plant doing the same amount of work—work of a similar character—you take authority now to grant him a wage raise, but you refuse the manufacturer or the businessman the right to grant that wage to the individual whom he employs. It does not smack of justice to me. It does not sound good; but we are not going to argue that here now. I do not think it is sound legislation. We have had to do many things that I do not like.

Now, another thing, we passed the 40-hour week. We passed that for one purpose, and one purpose only, and that was to give more jobs to more people. Today we are at war, and in a terrible war. We need everything that we can produce, not only on the farms, but in our industries. Every man in this country ought to work to the limit of his ability if we are going to win the war. In the face of conditions like that, is this Congress going to go away from here today and say that we are going

to have a 40-hour week, when the men in the trenches are working 24 hours a day, and perhaps some of them 2 or 3 days at a time? That does not sound good to me. I hate like everything to go away from here saying that, but I do not want to block legislation that will do some good, because I think in 4 months you will do more good in trying to get this legislation made permanent than if we block it today and then try to do it within 2 or 3 weeks after we meet in January. I think I would be doing a greater injury to the Government if I did that than if I allowed this to go through. If it were not for that, this legislation would never get through in the world, because I would not stand for it. I hope that the gentleman from Georgia will get his Labor Committee to extend that 40-hour week. If you do not get some new blood on that Labor Committee you will not do anything, because the radical labor leaders of this country have the chairman of that Labor Committee and a good many others, and it is a terrible shame. But if you are going to be in war you ought to extend that labor week, I would say as a minimum, to 44 hours, and it should go to 48 hours. That should be the minimum. I hope the gentleman, for the good of the country and for the good of the men who are in the armed services, will give attention to that, and extend this 40-hour week to at least 48 hours.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I want to thank the gentleman for his cooperation.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. While I realize this is temporary legislation and will extend for only a few months, I think it is all wrong that this measure to adjust the pay of Federal employees should come up at the closing hours of Congress, when we have had months and months during which to work on this legislation. This legislation has not even been before the Civil Service Committee of the House for consideration. The unfortunate thing is that if defeated, several thousand employees will not even get their pay checks as in the past. Because of them, that part of the legislation should probably be adopted. It may be possible, of course, that the Congress, after deliberation, would favor this legislation, but I say again it is not right and not the way to do, to bring legislation of this kind before this House at its closing hours, and when only a few are present, and have it passed in this manner. I realize the legislation is temporary, but even at that, the method of handling it is not the kind that should be advocated by the leadership of this House, nor should such methods be approved by its membership, as I view it.

This legislation, even though it is temporary, should not be brought to the floor of the House in this manner. The gentleman from Georgia, Chairman of the Committee on Civil Service well understands that.

It should have been submitted to the Civil Service Committee and then

brought to the floor in regular order, so it could be properly debated and subjected to amendments.

It is just not right, regardless of the merits of the legislation, to bring up a measure of such importance in the last hours of the session, when only a few Members are present, and ask that it be passed.

Mr. RAMSPECK. That would be the much better procedure, and I am sorry we have to take it up this way. But may I call the gentleman's attention to this fact, that this resolution, as passed by the other body, is almost identical with the two bills on which our committee held hearings?

Mr. REES of Kansas. But that committee never recommended either of those bills for passage. The committee never even voted on them, as a matter of fact.

Mr. RAMSPECK. The gentleman is correct about that. I appreciate his point of view.

Mr. REES of Kansas. We are now dealing with this big subject affecting a million people in a very unsatisfactory way, when we could have handled it otherwise if we had got down to business and worked on it as could have been done.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I think it could have been done much better. I hope the gentleman will join me in the next Congress in helping to work this out in some satisfactory way.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I tried all last year to get something done, but we did not even hold hearings.

Mr. RAMSPECK. We will in the next Congress.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I think the questions and observations directed to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Civil Service are certainly indicative of the feeling in this body on both sides of the aisle, that there is an over-staffing of several agencies of Government during wartime, and also a certain inefficiency which has crept into these agencies themselves. As a member of the Civil Service Committee, I am ready to join in the inquiry we are shortly to undertake to secure the facts and then to correct evils that are found to exist.

I feel, however, that Members of this House today, by the passage of this legislation, at least will attempt in a certain measure to bring justice to efficient and necessary Government employees. Such action on our part has been long overdue.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. RIZLEY. Did I correctly understand from the gentleman's statements that this legislation will effect and does provide for legislative relief?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes; it includes the clerks in Members' offices—but not the Members of Congress, I may say to the gentleman.

Mr. RIZLEY. But it would apply to our secretaries?

Mr. RAMSPECK. It applies only up to \$2,900.

Mr. RIZLEY. But it applies to the secretaries and clerks in our offices.

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is correct.

Mr. RIZLEY. It does include postal employees?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes; it does include postal employees.

Mr. RIZLEY. Can the gentleman tell me approximately the number of employees who will be affected by this legislation?

Mr. RAMSPECK. It affects all the employees of the Government, it affects 2½ million people in one way or another.

Mr. RIZLEY. The gentleman means that this bill provides an increase for approximately 2½ million Government employees?

Mr. RAMSPECK. No; I would not say that, because some are going to take a decrease. Some have been getting overtime pay on salaries of seven, eight, and nine thousand dollars. We are going to cut that out.

Mr. RIZLEY. Can the gentleman tell me approximately the number of employees who will receive overtime pay under this legislation if we pass it today?

Mr. RAMSPECK. The gentleman means who have not received it heretofore?

Mr. RIZLEY. Yes; who have not heretofore received it, but who will be affected and will in the future receive overtime pay.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Fifty-two percent of the employees have been receiving overtime pay up to November 30. This brings the other 42 percent under the same provision, with the exception that those like rural letter carriers and certain other employees, including employees in the offices of Members and in the Capitol generally—except those under the Classification Act—who do not work on a weekly or hourly basis will get a 10-percent increase in their pay up to \$2,900. Just how many of that 42 percent are going to get the 10-percent increase and how many are going to get overtime, I cannot tell the gentleman.

Mr. RIZLEY. I am sure the able chairman of the committee can tell me the approximate amount in dollars and cents this legislation will cost the Government.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I do not believe I have those figures with me. I should say it would cost somewhere around \$250,000,000 on an annual basis. This bill, however, is for a 4 months' period only.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. PRIEST. In connection with the pay increase for postal employees, does this bill provide 10-percent payment on overtime for those employees who are now receiving compensatory time? There are certain groups of postal employees who work overtime but on a compensatory-time basis, rather than a monetary payment. Would this bill apply to that group?

Mr. RAMSPECK. It is my understanding that Saturday half holidays

are suspended and that they get overtime pay instead of compensatory time.

Mr. HARRIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS of Virginia. Are the custodial employees of the post offices included in this bill?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes.

Mr. HARRIS of Virginia. On an overtime basis of 10 percent?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I think on an overtime basis, because they work on a weekly or hourly basis.

Mr. HARRIS of Virginia. The spirit of this thing is that those employees who work overtime and are given compensatory time will now be given overtime, or 10 percent, instead of compensatory time off.

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is right.

Mr. HARRIS of Virginia. It includes all field employees as well as those in Washington?

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is correct.

Mr. HARNES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNES. What effect does this bill have on an employee whose salary is \$5,000 or more?

Mr. RAMSPECK. He does not get any increase.

Mr. HARNES. The employee who gets \$2,900 a year receives a 10-percent increase if he is not on the overtime basis?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes.

Mr. HARNES. Suppose he gets \$3,000?

Mr. RAMSPECK. He will get an increase on the first \$2,900.

Mr. HARNES. Suppose he gets \$3,900?

Mr. RAMSPECK. He will get an increase on the first \$2,900.

Mr. HARNES. But if he receives \$5,000 he does not get any increase at all?

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is right.

Mr. HARNES. He does not even get an increase on the first \$2,900?

Mr. RAMSPECK. No.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. This is merely a stop-gap and the legislation will expire in April 1943?

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is correct.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman and the Civil Service Committee anticipate legislation when the new Congress convenes?

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is correct.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RICH. This is perhaps the last time I will ask this question. The gentleman says it is going to cost \$250,000,000 annually to put this into effect?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes.

Mr. RICH. I have asked practically every chairman of every committee in the House of Representatives the question, noting the fact that on December 11 the national debt was \$106,563,000,000 and that in February, or by February, Secretary Morgenthau states that they

are going to ask to raise the national debt to \$200,000,000,000. I am going to ask the gentleman this question, Where are you going to get the money?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I think that is a very pertinent question. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has served a good purpose by constantly repeating that question. I do not think I am as well qualified to answer it as the gentleman is himself. I am quite sure he knows better where we are going to get it, if we are going to get it, than I do.

Mr. RICH. If I were going to get it, I would get it, first, by trying to save on Government expenses. Next year, if there is anything I may say to the Congress, I would say that it might be well worth while trying your best to economize. That is the only way you are ever going to do it.

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is good advice.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF]?

There was no objection.

DISPLAY AND USE OF THE FLAG OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk House Joint Resolution 359, to amend Public Law 623, Seventy-seventh Congress, entitled "Joint resolution to codify and emphasize existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America," with Senate amendment thereto and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That Public Law No. 623, approved June 22, 1942, entitled 'Joint resolution to codify and emphasize existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America,' be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"That the following codification of existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America be, and it is hereby, established for the use of such civilians or civilian groups or organizations as may not be required to conform with regulations promulgated by one or more executive departments of the Government of the United States.

"Sec. 2. (a) It is the universal custom to display the flag only from sunrise to sunset on buildings and on stationary flagstaffs in the open. However, the flag may be displayed at night upon special occasions when it is desired to produce a patriotic effect.

"(b) The flag should be hoisted briskly and lowered ceremoniously.

"(c) The flag should not be displayed on days when the weather is inclement,

"(d) The flag should be displayed on all days when the weather permits, especially on New Year's Day, January 1; Inauguration Day, January 20; Lincoln's Birthday, February 12; Washington's Birthday, February 22; Army Day, April 6; Easter Sunday (variable); Mother's Day, second Sunday in May; Memorial Day (half staff until noon), May 30; Flag Day, June 14; Independence Day, July 4; Labor Day, first Monday in September; Constitution Day, September 17; Columbus Day, October 12; Navy Day, October 27; Armistice Day, November 11; Thanksgiving Day, fourth Thursday in November; Christmas Day, December 25; such other days as may be proclaimed by the President of the United States; the birthdays of States (dates of admission); and on State holidays.

"(e) The flag should be displayed daily, weather permitting, on or near the main administration building of every public institution.

"(f) The flag should be displayed in or near every polling place on election days.

"(g) The flag should be displayed during school days in or near every schoolhouse.

"Sec. 3. That the flag, when carried in a procession with another flag or flags, should be either on the marching right; that is, the flag's own right, or, if there is a line of other flags, in front of the center of that line.

"(a) The flag should not be displayed on a float in a parade except from a staff, or as provided in subsection (i).

"(b) The flag should not be draped over the hood, top, sides, or back of a vehicle or of a railroad train or a boat. When the flag is displayed on a motorcar, the staff shall be fixed firmly to the chassis or clamped to the radiator cap.

"(c) No other flag or pennant should be placed above or, if on the same level, to the right of the flag of the United States of America, except during church services conducted by naval chaplains at sea, when the church pennant may be flown above the flag during church services for the personnel of the Navy.

"(d) The flag of the United States of America, when it is displayed with another flag against a wall from crossed staffs, should be on the right, the flag's own right, and its staff should be in front of the staff of the other flag.

"(e) The flag of the United States of America should be at the center and at the highest point of the group when a number of flags of States or localities or pennants of societies are grouped and displayed from staffs.

"(f) When flags of States, cities, or localities, or pennants of societies are flown on the same halyard with the flag of the United States, the latter should always be at the peak. When the flags are flown from adjacent staffs, the flag of the United States should be hoisted first and lowered last. No such flag or pennant may be placed above the flag of the United States or to the right of the flag of the United States.

"(g) When flags of two or more nations are displayed, they are to be flown from separate staffs of the same height. The flags should be of approximately equal size. International usage forbids the display of the flag of one nation above that of another nation in time of peace.

"(h) When the flag of the United States is displayed from a staff projecting horizontally or at an angle from the window sill, balcony, or front of a building, the union of the flag should be placed at the peak of the staff unless the flag is at half staff. When the flag is suspended over a sidewalk from a rope extending from a house to a pole at the edge of the sidewalk, the flag should be hoisted out, union first, from the building.

"(i) When the flag is displayed otherwise than by being flown from a staff, it should be displayed flat, whether indoors or out, or so suspended that its folds fall as free as though the flag were staffed.

"(j) When the flag is displayed over the middle of the street, it should be suspended vertically with the union to the north in an east and west street or to the east in a north and south street.

"(k) When used on a speaker's platform, the flag, if displayed flat, should be displayed above and behind the speaker. When displayed from a staff in a church or public auditorium, if it is displayed in the chancel of a church, or on the speaker's platform in a public auditorium, the flag should occupy the position of honor and be placed at the clergyman's or speaker's right as he faces the congregation or audience. Any other flag so displayed in the chancel or on the platform should be placed at the clergyman's or speaker's left as he faces the congregation or audience. But when the flag is displayed from a staff in a church or public auditorium elsewhere than in the chancel or on the platform it shall be placed in the position of honor at the right of the congregation or audience as they face the chancel or platform. Any other flag so displayed should be placed on the left of the congregation or audience as they face the chancel or platform.

"(l) The flag should form a distinctive feature of the ceremony of unveiling a statue or monument, but it should never be used as the covering for the statue or monument.

"(m) The flag, when flown at half staff, should be first hoisted to the peak for an instant and then lowered to the half-staff position. The flag should be again raised to the peak before it is lowered for the day. By "half staff" is meant lowering the flag to one-half the distance between the top and bottom of the staff. Crepe streamers may be affixed to spear heads or flagstaves in a parade only by order of the President of the United States.

"(n) When the flag is used to cover a casket, it should be so placed that the union is at the head and over the left shoulder. The flag should not be lowered into the grave or allowed to touch the ground.

"Sec. 4. That no disrespect should be shown to the flag of the United States of America, the flag should not be dipped to any person or thing. Regimental colors, State flags, and organization or institutional flags are to be dipped as a mark of honor.

"(a) The flag should never be displayed with the union down save as a signal of dire distress.

"(b) The flag should never touch anything beneath it, such as the ground, the floor, water, or merchandise.

"(c) The flag should never be carried flat or horizontally, but always aloft and free.

"(d) The flag should never be used as drapery of any sort whatsoever, never festooned, drawn back, nor up, in folds, but always allowed to fall free. Bunting of blue, white, and red, always arranged with the blue above, the white in the middle, and the red below, should be used for covering a speaker's desk, draping the front of a platform, and for decoration in general.

"(e) The flag should never be fastened, displayed, used, or stored in such a manner as will permit it to be easily torn, soiled, or damaged in any way.

"(f) The flag should never be used as a covering for a ceiling.

"(g) The flag should never have placed upon it, nor on any part of it, nor attached to it any mark, insignia, letter, word, figure, design, picture, or drawing of any nature.

"(h) The flag should never be used as a receptacle for receiving, holding, carrying, or delivering anything.

"(i) The flag should never be used for advertising purposes in any manner whatsoever. It should not be embroidered on such articles as cushions or handkerchiefs and the like, printed or otherwise impressed on paper napkins or boxes or anything that is designed for temporary use and discard; or used as any portion of a costume or athletic uniform.

Advertising signs should not be fastened to a staff or halyard from which the flag is flown.

"(j) The flag, when it is in such condition that it is no longer a fitting emblem for display, should be destroyed in a dignified way, preferably by burning.

"Sec. 5. That during the ceremony of hoisting or lowering the flag or when the flag is passing in a parade or in a review, all persons present should face the flag, stand at attention, and salute. Those present in uniform should render the military salute. When not in uniform, men should remove the headdress with the right hand holding it at the left shoulder, the hand being over the heart. Men without hats should salute in the same manner. Aliens should stand at attention. Women should salute by placing the right hand over the heart. The salute to the flag in the moving column should be rendered at the moment the flag passes.

"Sec. 6. That when the national anthem is played and the flag is not displayed, all present should stand and face toward the music. Those in uniform should salute at the first note of the anthem, retaining this position until the last note. All others should stand at attention, men removing the headdress. When the flag is displayed all present should face the flag and salute.

"Sec. 7. That the pledge of allegiance to the flag, "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation indivisible, with liberty and justice for all," be rendered by standing with the right hand over the heart. However, civilians will always show full respect to the flag when the pledge is given by merely standing at attention, men removing the headdress. Persons in uniform shall render the military salute.

"Sec. 8. Any rule or custom pertaining to the display of the flag of the United States of America, set forth herein, may be altered, modified, or repealed, or additional rules with respect thereto may be prescribed, by the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, whenever he deems it to be appropriate or desirable; and any such alteration or additional rule shall be set forth in a proclamation."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Hobbs]?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand this involves no change in the law itself?

Mr. HOBBS. No change whatever. It simply puts the original act in its amended form, as the Public Printer desires it and as the Joint Committee on Printing must have it for printing under the rule. I am greatly indebted to Mr. Ansel Wold for calling this necessity to my attention, and to the Senate committee and the Senate for making the bill comply therewith.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, has there been an explanation made of this bill before?

Mr. HOBBS. Yes, sir; when it passed the House. The only thing in the world this does is to make two substantive amendments and several clerical amendments that correct verbiage or other mistakes. For instance, instead of using the term "hauling" the flag down, we substitute the word "lowering," and so on. This is a nonpenal act. These amendments were fully explained at the time the bill passed the House, and there has been no substantial change whatsoever in the bill as amended in the Senate. It was simply amended by setting

out the law at length with the amendments incorporated therein, rather than the way we did it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOEBS]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AUTHORIZED TO MAKE INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the sine die adjournment of the House, special and standing Committees of the House authorized to make investigations may file their reports with the Speaker not later than noon, January 3, 1943, for printing as public documents.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the sine die adjournment of the House the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

GENERAL EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House shall have the privilege, for 5 calendar days after the adjournment sine die, to extend and revise their own remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on more than one subject, if they so desire, and may also include therein such short quotations as may be necessary to explain or complete such extension of remarks; but this order shall not apply to any subject matter which may have occurred or to any speech delivered subsequent to the adjournment of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARNESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short poem.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 194. An act for the relief of the Upham Telephone & Electric Co., Upham, N. Dak.;

H. R. 1646. An act for the relief of George Gels, and the administrator of the estate of Joseph Glaser, deceased;

H. R. 2894. An act for the relief of Mrs. William Butak, Dorothy Clyde, Mrs. Albert Westcott, Mrs. Albert Meyer, Florence Johnson, Marie Grill, Mrs. Leo Maloney, Marian McDonald, Mrs. Edward Beier, Mrs. E. L. Bly, Mrs. Lucien Miller, Lois Kehnl, Reka Berg, Mrs. Ollis Klicker, Wilma Vogler, and Mary Chisholm;

H. R. 2970. An act for the relief of Hiram Colwell;

H. R. 2973. An act for the relief of George O. Hanford;

H. R. 4029. An act for the relief of Catherine Barrett;

H. R. 4741. An act for the relief of the Midwest Oil Co.;

H. R. 4898. An act for the relief of Bothilda Stender;

H. R. 4918. An act for the relief of Anna J. Krogoll;

H. R. 5154. An act for the relief of the estate of Elmer White;

H. R. 5157. An act to reimburse F. E. Wester for labor and material used in the emergency construction of buildings and utilities at Civilian Conservation Corps Camp Escanaba;

H. R. 5175. An act for the relief of Edward Workman;

H. R. 5274. An act for the relief of Michael Leo Fitzpatrick;

H. R. 5409. An act for the relief of Gwendolyn Anne Olhava and Anthony L. Olhava;

H. R. 5486. An act to provide for means of egress for buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5649. An act for the relief of Alice Comas, Robert Comas, and Frances Williams;

H. R. 5812. An act for the relief of William E. Averitt;

H. R. 6095. An act for the relief of the estate of Mrs. H. L. Smith, deceased;

H. R. 6285. An act for the relief of Clarence A. Houser and his wife, Mrs. Jewel Houser;

H. R. 6366. An act for the relief of Alex Lawson;

H. R. 6370. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ching Shee (Ching Toy Wun);

H. R. 6489. An act for the relief of I. Arthur Kramer;

H. R. 6510. An act for the relief of L. H. Miller;

H. R. 6520. An act for the relief of Jane A. Thornton;

H. R. 6569. An act for the relief of William M. Miller;

H. R. 6653. An act for the relief of William R. Ivey;

H. R. 6677. An act for the relief of Ronald Leroy Chen;

H. R. 6895. An act for the relief of Mrs. Esther Mann;

H. R. 6749. An act for the relief of Mrs. Bessie Schakett;

H. R. 6771. An act for the relief of Lillian J. Delavergne and Myrla Delavergne;

H. R. 6780. An act for the relief of J. M. Jesse;

H. R. 6839. A act relating to the appointment and retirement in the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve of persons with physical disabilities, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6863. An act for the relief of Thomas W. Dowd;

H. R. 6873. An act for the relief of Maude Leach;

H. R. 6923. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ada F. Ogle;

H. R. 6924. An act for the relief of Joseph F. Gordon;

H. R. 7012. An act for the relief of Litchfield Bros., Aurora, N. C.;

H. R. 7035. An act for the relief of Mr. Garland Gailey, of Baldwin, Ga., and Mrs. Clara Mae Gailey, of Baldwin, Ga.;

H. R. 7167. An act for the relief of Elmore Lee Lane;

H. R. 7168. An act for the relief of Grover C. Wedgwood;

H. R. 7185. An act for the relief of Mrs. James Q. Mattox;

H. R. 7247. An act for the relief of Silas Frankel;

H. R. 7288. An act to relieve certain employees of the Veterans' Administration from financial liability for certain overpayments and allow such credit therefor as is necessary in the accounts of certain disbursing officers;

H. R. 7316. An act for the relief of Dr. J. M. Scott and Mrs. J. M. Scott;

H. R. 7333. An act for the relief of Arkansas Gazette, Hope Star, the Hope Journal, Arkansas Democrat Co.;

H. R. 7357. An act for the relief of Madeline Flori;

H. R. 7518. An act for the relief of Bernice Pyke, Arthur P. Fenton, Carl E. Moore, and Clifford W. Pollock;

H. R. 7522. An act to amend the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1943, so as to authorize the use of public-school buildings in the District of Columbia as and for day nurseries and nursery schools, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7587. An act for the relief of Etta A. Thompson, Marion E. Graham, Ruth Irene Morgan, and Alice K. Weber;

H. R. 7633. An act to increase the pay and allowances of the Army Nurse Corps, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7649. An act for the relief of Ralph B. Randall, rural rehabilitation supervisor, Farm Security Administration, Visalia, Calif.;

H. R. 7650. An act for the relief of Col. Leo A. Luttringer, United States property and disbursing officer for Pennsylvania;

H. R. 7651. An act for the relief of William F. Perkins, rural rehabilitation supervisor, Farm Security Administration, Pinal County, Ariz.;

H. R. 7652. An act for the relief of Warren M. Engstrand, grant supervisor, Farm Security Administration, Bakersfield, Calif.;

H. R. 7653. An act for the relief of Ensign Donald L. Grunsky;

H. R. 7705. An act for the relief of James E. Savage;

H. R. 7781. An act to define the real property exempt from taxation in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 7844. An act to amend sections 3, 4, 5, and 6 of the act approved March 7, 1942 (Public Law 490, 77th Cong.), providing for continuing pay and allowances of certain missing persons; and

H. J. Res. 365. Joint resolution to amend the Revenue Act of 1942.

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 2528. An act to provide for the settlement of certain claims of the Government of the United States on behalf of American nationals against the Government of Mexico; and

S. J. Res. 140. Joint resolution granting permission to Hugh S. Cumming, Surgeon General (retired) of the United States Public Health Service, to accept certain decorations bestowed upon him by the Republics of Colombia, Haiti, and Chile.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, December 16, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Resolution 576. Resolution authorizing the printing of "Questions and Answers on the Tax Bill"; without amendment (Rept. No. 2739). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. NICHOLS: Select Committee to Investigate Air Accidents. Report pursuant to House Resolutions 125 and 403, Seventy-seventh Congress. Resolutions concerning an accident which occurred on May 1, 1942, making an approach to the Salt Lake City, Utah, Airport; with amendment (Rept. No. 2740). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 7866. A bill to provide for the restoration to active duty and/or advancement in rank of certain World War veterans; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HARRIS of Virginia:

H. J. Res. 370. Joint resolution extending the period for which overtime rates of compensation may be paid under the act of June 28, 1940 (54 Stat. 676), October 21, 1940 (54 Stat. 1205), and June 3, 1941 (55 Stat. 241); to the Committee on the Civil Service.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 16, 1942

(Legislative day of Monday, November 30, 1942)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, in this solemn hour fraught with a sense of finality we pause to praise the Power that hath made and preserved us a nation. As the sands of this year of peril, toil, and pain run low, we to whom has been entrusted the ministry of governance come with sobered hearts to write the final word in an epic chapter of our national history. Frail human hands have carried the precious ark of our heritage through the encircling gloom; yet we dare believe that Thy hand has been guiding and guarding.

We thank Thee that in the name of a free people ours has been the high privilege to sign anew the immortal Declaration crimsoned with the devotion of the founding fathers: "We mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor." Now, of the record made in this hallowed Chamber in months of destiny, we can but say, "What we have written, we have written." We ask the benediction of Thy grace upon all wise and good decisions and beseech Thee to forgive and overrule all that

denies. Thy will for us and mankind. As in the Name of the Lord our God we have set up our banners, we march on toward stern and bitter days with assurance that as we fight to make men free we march with Thee. Grant us wisdom, grant us courage, that we fail not man nor Thee. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, December 15, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

ATTACK ON PEARL HARBOR—RESOLUTION BY NATIONAL CONGRESS OF THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a radiogram addressed to the President of the Senate embodying a resolution adopted by the Senate and Chamber of Deputies of the Dominican Republic, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Translation]

CUIDAD TRUJILLO, DOMINICAN REPUBLIC,
December 7, 1942.

HON. HENRY A. WALLACE,
President of the Senate of the
United States of North America,
Washington, D. C.:

The Senate and Chamber of Deputies of the Dominican Republic, meeting in joint session, has just carried out before diplomatic representatives of the friendly nations a resolution voted by the National Congress at the suggestion of the Honorable President of the Republic, Generalissimo Dr. Trujillo Milina, which reads as follows:

"Be it resolved, (1) To declare the 7th day of December of each year for the duration of the war in which the United Nations are now engaged as a day of reaffirmation of the solidarity of the Dominican Republic with the United States of North America, and (2) to hold a joint and solemn session of both chambers on the 7th of December of this year for the purpose of publicly consecrating this date and of confirming the faith of the Dominican people in the final victory of the United Nations." In uniting in this way the sentiments of the Dominican people with those of your great Nation in the remembrance of this sad date on which the peace of the continent was disturbed and the political, economic, and cultural life of the Americas threatened by the treacherous attack on Pearl Harbor by Japanese forces, we confirm the faith of the Republic in the victory of the United Nations, among which the noble Nation which you represent in Congress carries with glory and honor the watchword of continental solidarity.

PORFIRIO HERRERA,

President of the Senate.

MANUEL A. PENA BATLLE,

President of the Chamber of Deputies.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AND SUPPRESSION OF VICE AROUND MILITARY CAMPS—LIST OF PETITIONS

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a list of petitions I have received in support of Senate bill 860 signed by an aggregate of 1,482 persons in 8 States.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Petitions received by Senator O'DANIEL in support of Senate bill 860—

Texas:	
Panola County.....	9
Montague County.....	400
City of Dilley.....	1
City of Ricardo.....	1
California: Los Angeles.....	46
Illinois: Lawrence County.....	98
New York: Rockland County.....	124
Ohio: Creston.....	12
Pennsylvania: Erie County.....	210
South Dakota: Sioux Falls.....	468
Washington: Seattle.....	113
8 States—total.....	1,482

GOVERNMENTAL ECONOMY—RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY CONFERENCE OF AMERICAN SMALL BUSINESS ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution on the subject of governmental economy, which was adopted by the conference of American small business organizations at a meeting held at the Hotel Roosevelt, New York, on December 10, 1942.

In that connection, I invite attention to the fact that the organization highly commends two congressional committees, namely, the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, of which the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is chairman; and the subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee, which deals with the transfer of personnel and equipment, of which subcommittee the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] is chairman.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Congress has appropriated for the current fiscal year \$74,000,000,000 for prosecution of the war and \$6,000,000,000 for nonmilitary purposes; and

Whereas American taxpayers will be called upon to contribute approximately \$24,000,000,000 of this sum next year; and

Whereas this fiscal year the Government must borrow \$57,000,000,000, thereby raising the Federal public debt to \$147,000,000,000; and

Whereas in our opinion the American people will cheerfully contribute and pay any expenditure vital to victory but do not believe that waste and extravagance of manpower, service, enterprise, and Federal funds should be condoned by the Congress or the executive branch of our Government; and

Whereas the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Expenditures has declared the "surface of economy has only been scratched" in Washington: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Conference of American Small Business Organizations endorse the official economy effort of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures headed by Senator HARRY FLOOD BYRD, of Virginia, and the Committee on Transfer of Employees, headed by Senator MILLARD TYDINGS, of Maryland; and that the chairman of this conference be, and he is hereby, directed to communicate with the President of the United States, members of the Cabinet, Members of Congress, sending them a copy of this resolution, and urge and demand that all items not absolutely essential be eliminated from the 1944 Federal Budget.